00111541

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 28 September, 2015

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER,

CONDUCTED BY

Members of the Established Church,

FOR

111541
Al

THE YEAR 1838.

C-E-I

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCXXXVIII.

God
230.05
Chr/Chr
111541

PRINTED BY NUTTALL AND HODGSON,
GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

PREFACE.

Our annual Preface is always with us a solemn thing; it tells of another large portion of human existence passed away; while it reminds us in our public capacity, as well as our readers and ourselves individually, to take account of our stewardship. The closing of the present volume peculiarly suggests these monitory reminiscences; for it is the first of a New Series; and its pages have recorded the decease of almost the only survivors who planned or conducted the earlier volumes. The very first Number mentioned the departure of that venerable servant of his Divine Lord, the late Mr. Babington, one of the projectors of the work, and a frequent and highly valued contributor to its early pages. Shortly after, we had to announce the removal of Mr. Macaulay, its Editor and chief writer from the first volume till the year 1816. The subject has again pressed upon us in reviewing the Life of Mr. Wilberforce; as where he mentions, March 26, 1802, "Talked in the evening about the Christian Observer; fixed Macaulay should take management;—he, Pearson, and Babington with us;" —Mr. Thornton also, and Mr. Stephen had just been named, with an "et cætera," which may have included Mr. Venn and other early friends of the work.

These recollections suggest three questions: What was the design of the publication? was that design laudable? and, has it been consistently kept in mind?

The design was to endeavour to promote the glory of God and the salvation of men, by setting forth the doctrines, and inculcating the precepts, of the Gospel, as understood and received by the Church of England. General discussions, matters of taste, science, and literature, and a brief memorial of the passing events of the day, were proposed to be kept subordinate to the above leading object, and to be rendered ancillary to it. By the doctrines of the Church of England was understood, generally, those tenets in which the whole family of the orthodox Protestant reformation concur with us, as recognized in our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy; and, specifically, those points in which we differ from the Church of Rome, and also those in which we differ from some of our sister Protestant churches; particularly in our adherence to the Apostolical model of Episcopal government. In regard to differences within our own pale, the conductors declared their firm intention, God being their helper, to uphold, with the Bible in one hand, and the formularies of our Church as an invaluable com-

ment on it in the other, the doctrines set forth by our venerable reformers; the doctrines contended for by our Cranmers, Latimers, Jewells, and Hookers, as opposed to the innovations of that newer school, whose leaders thought the Anglican Reformation had receded too far from Popery, and who, among many other errors of no small magnitude, embodied that which was indeed the foundation of them all, the denial of the scriptural doctrine of Justification by Faith, as set forth in all the Confessions of Protestantism, and the restoration of which, from the overlayings of Popery, was the glory of the Reformation.

To those who believe that the above is a correct estimate of the doctrines of Scripture and of our Church, no other proof can be necessary that it was desirable to establish a monthly periodical publication which should uphold them, than the simple fact that there was no such publication at that period in existence. The doctrine of justification by works, now set forth chiefly in a stealthy and ambaginous manner, which lands us in that conclusion, though avoiding a direct word-for-word contradiction of the Articles, was then unequivocally avowed in volumes for the rich, and tracts for the poor; in University discourses, and Visitation charges, and, worst of all, in innumerable parochial sermons; and if the Christian Observer has done no other good, we believe it will be allowed to have had some share in promoting that return to a more scriptural tone of preaching which Secker, and Horsley, and Porteus declared was necessary to save us from being mere "apes of Epictetus."

With regard to the third question, we are not very solicitous to reply to it, because whatever other faults have been imputed to us it has not been said that we are inconsistent; indeed the main charge is, that we persist in the same errors with which we set out; and that in opposing certain modern doctrines we are only refurbishing the weapons with which Wilberforce, Thornton, Pearson, Babington, Richmond, Scott, Newton, Simeon, Milner, Farish, and Hannah More, were contending against the lethal writings of too many divines of the last generation. The New Series, it was expressly stated, originated in no change whatever in the principles or conduct of the work, but was solely for the purpose of introducing it with more convenience among new subscribers.

After writing the above, we took up the first volume of the former series, and laid it side by side with the first of the New. We trust that the comparison is not unfavourable in any respect to our present friends and correspondents; but of this it were fitter that others should judge than ourselves. But we have been struck with the coincidence of many passages to the circumstances of the present day, and we will quote a few lines from the Prospectus, the first

Number, and the first Preface, as bearing upon some particulars above alluded to. The New Series will thus renew, and pledge itself to, the manifesto of the old.

"Their chief object," said the original Prospectus, as set forth by Mr. Wilberforce and his friends, "will be to promote the increase of sound theological knowledge, and to delineate the characters of primitive and unadulterated Christianity. As members of the Established Church, they will occasionally examine, in a temperate manner, the principles on which that Church is founded; and they will endeavour to explain and enforce the pious tendency of her rites, ceremonies, and liturgy. But in these, and in all other discussions, they will endeavour carefully to avoid whatever may tend to lessen that Christian love which ought to unite the members of Christ of every denomination." In reference to some of the party appellations which have divided the Church, the originators of the work expressed their wish to lose them altogether "in the more catholic term of Bible Christians;" and "to give the right hand of fellowship, as to true believers and true churchmen, so far as these points are concerned, to all who unequivocally, and with the heart, regard salvation as originating wholly in grace, applied through the instrumentality of that faith which is the gift of the Holy Spirit, and which brings the believer into a state of acceptance with God, by making him partaker of the merits of Christ, and prepares him for heaven by maturing him in love and obedience."

The conductors further expressed their opinion that "a spirit of forbearance and Christian charity, is perfectly consistent with the strictest orthodoxy;" and they "indulged a sanguine hope that Christians in general would concur in this sentiment;" but they add, in their very first Preface, that "their expectation had been considerably disappointed." Calvinists thought them too Arminian, and Arminians too Calvinistic; "the cold and formal professor of Christianity stigmatizes," said they, "our doctrines as canting and methodistical; while the heated enthusiast denies that spirituality or evangelical truth can be found in our pages; some of our correspondents complain of our manifesting too great mildness and conciliation towards Dissenters;" while "on the other side some Dissenters have charged us with being bigoted persecuting churchmen, and have not only treated us as adversaries of the Dissenting interest, but as the enemies of Christianity itself." We quote this passage, because Dissenters have of late eulogised the pristine "mildness and conciliation" of the Christian Observer; as though it had latterly changed its tone. Even had it done so, there would have been a reason, if not an excuse, in the altered tone of the Dissenters themselves, who were comparatively quiet when our National Church was in a

state of awful supineness, but have increased in bitterness in the very proportion in which, according to their own admission, our Clergy have become more evangelical in their doctrines, and more devoted in their lives. But the fact that we have changed our tone, is not true, as the above extract proves; for the fathers of the present race of Dissenters charged our predecessors quite as strongly with being "bigoted persecuting churchmen," and "the enemies of Christianity itself," as their sons do us; and as the sons say that our predecessors were mild and candid, the next generation may say that we were so too, when the full effects of the modern schemes of certain Dissenting leaders shall have been fully developed in all their baneful results.

We will quote one short passage more from the Preface of 1802, adopting it as the manifesto of that of 1838. "In respect to doctrines," says that Preface, "WE ACKNOWLEDGE NO SUPREME AUTHORITY BUT THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; approving at the same time [most heartily] of that exposition of them which is contained in the Articles, the Liturgy, and the Homilies of the Church of England. *Beyond this we do not engage to submit to any human authority.*"

We have room only for a few lines more, and the passage which we will select is the following, from the View of Public Affairs in the very first Number, in which the reader will recognize the pen of Mr. Wilberforce:

"Let us remember that we have received from our forefathers, as a sacred deposit entrusted to them from above, OUR CHRISTIAN SABBATH; THE SANCTITY OF OUR MARRIAGE VOWS; *and all those laws, habits, and institutions by which practical religion and morals have been so long upheld among us, and the domestic and social happiness of millions has been secured; and let us see to it that we guard them from further violation and disparagement, and endeavour rather to transmit them to our children, together with the principles by which they are to be maintained and confirmed, in renovated strength.*"

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

page

JANUARY.

RELIG. & MISCEL. COMMUNICATIONS.—End of all Things..Letter from Dr. J. P. Smith; with Reply..Consecrating Churches..Extempore Preaching..Relics at Aix-la-Chapelle..Church Spoliation in America..Thoughts on Religious Poetry..Burning Sacramental Wine..Religious Memorials of Washington..Art of Teaching—Use of Words..Authority of First Four Councils..Newman on Romanism: Tradition ..... 1—44

POETRY.—Hope in Death..Idle Reading ..A Perfect World..The Bark..Faith.. 49

REVIEW OF—Faber on Justification..Preston on Scriptural Instruction..Murray on the Vital Principle ..... 51—58

OBIT.—Bishop Burgess 64

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.—Past Year .. Parliament..Civil List..Church-notices Act .. Wills Act..Canada..New Zealand ... 64

ANSWERS.—Dr. Smith .. On Coleridge.. Dr. Pusey, Townsend .. Acknowledgment to Friends 71

FEBRUARY.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Inconsideration.. Conversion of Dr. Johnson..Reading the Lessons by Laymen..Cumming on Presbyterianism; with Remarks..Re-action from exaggerated Statements..Newman on Romanism; Tradition .. Worldly Habits; Works of Fiction..Dr. Pusey on Innovations at Oxford..Thoughts on Religious Poetry .....73—114

POETRY.—Parting and Finding.."He was transfigured" .."The alabaster box".. "Durable riches" 119

REV. OF—Faber on Justification..Acworth's Sermon on Babington..Coates and Wakefield on New Zealand .....121—131

OBIT.—Mrs. Corrie 140

PUB. AFF.—Canada..National Education ..Idolatry in India..... 143

ANSWERS.—Papers received..Gathercole, &c. 141

MARCH.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Efficacy of Affliction..M'Ghee on the Roman Catholic Statutes..Object of Christianity..Reading Lessons by Laymen..Written and Un-written Sermons..Dr. Pusey on Innovations at Oxford..The Proto-English Martyr, Sautre.....145—187

REV. OF—Sturge and Harvey on the West Indies 189

PUB. AFF.—Canada..Bill for Abolition of Sunday Trading..National Education.. Letters of Marque..New Zealand..... 205

ANSWERS.—Papers received..Bowles and Coleridge..Clergy Assurance Society.. Scottish Episcopal Church, &c. 208

APRIL.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Efficacy of Affliction..Sabbath-breaking in High Stations ..Christian Knowledge Society's Reformers ..Allegorizings of the Fathers.. 1 Thess. iv. 6..Cambridge Prayer-Book ..Reasons for not attending Balls..Study of Scripture..Laymen Reading the Lessons..Bread of Prothesis .. Extempore Preaching..Individual Antichrist..Christian Observer's Remarks on Dr. Pusey's Letter..Dr. Vaughan and the Dissenters ..Laymen Reading the Lessons ...209—252

POETRY.—Good Friday, Lent, and Dedication of a Church, from Chandler's "Hymns of the Primitive Church".. Pozzuoli, from "Solace of Song"..... 254

REV. OF—Faber on Justification *(continued)*..National Education: Bishop Blomfield's Sermon..Rev. H. Melvill's ..Central Society's publications..Rev. R. Burgess..House of Commons Report 257—266

PUB. AFF.—Plumptre's Lord's-day Bill.. Sunday Railroad Travelling .. Hippodrome Bill .. Poynder on Idolatry.. Clergy Residence and Anti-Plurality Bill ..West India Apprenticeship .. Irish Tithes..... 270

ANSWERS 272

MAY.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Efficacy of the Love of God..Peace in Believing..Study of Scripture..Restoration of the Jews to Palestine..Prophetic 1260 Days..Reply to Dr. J. Pye Smith on Balaam..Kelly's Statement respecting Knox..Voluntary System in America..Death-bed of H. More .....273—307

POETRY.—Flowers .. Anemone .. Preach the Gospel 309

REV. OF—Newman on Romanism..Prayer Book and Homily Society, Coronation Service .....310—322

PUB. AFF.—Parliament .. Hippodrome.. Proceedings at Court..Christian Knowledge Society..Dr. Chalmers 335

ANSWERS.—Papers received.. Fine Arts 336

JUNE.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—The Ascension.. Study of Scripture..Popular Hymn..Dr. J. Pye Smith on Balaam..Antiquities of Oxford..Reminiscences of Bishop Hall, No. I..H. More's Removal from Barley Wood..Ireland, with Remarks on the Murder of A. Cooper..Kelly on the Last Days of Knox .....337—370

REV. OF—National Education:—Sermons by the Bishop of London; Rev. H. Melvill; and the Rev. R. Burgess; Central Society's Publications; and the House of Commons' Report..Bishop of Ripon's Questions for Ordination, &c... Cobwebs to catch Calvinists..Efficacy of Baptism, by Archbp. Laurence..Oxford Tracts unmasked, by M. Jackson..Life of W. Wilberforce .....378—403

OBIT.—Dr. Marshman 405

PUB. AFF.—Colquhoun on Ireland..Irish Education..Acland on Irish Tithes..Wilmot on West India Apprenticeship.. Plumptre's Lord's-day Bill..Dr. Chalmers and the Dissenters..Coronation..Steam Ships; Talleyrand..Rellgious Societies 407

ANSWERS 408

JULY.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Our Lord's Temptation..Offices of Christ..Reminiscences of Bishop Hall, No. II..Baxter on Laymen reading the Lessons..Death-bed of Sarah More..Familiarity in Hymns.. Vaughan and the Established Church.. Laurence and Heber, Bradford, Scott,

page
and Biddulph on Baptism..Quakers respecting Tithe..Restoration of the Jews ..Scottish Episcopal Church..Pronunciation of Scripture Names..Remarks on a Popular Hymn .....417—450
POETRY.—French Lines..Latin Epitaph ..Restless Night.. "But are as the Angels" 451
REV. OF—Sermons by A. W. Hare..... 453
OBIT.—Dr. Marshman [*concluded*] 467
PUB. AFF.—Magazines..Irish Measures.. Plurality Bill..Sunday Trading Bill, and Rail-road Mails..West India Apprenticeship..Idolatry in India..Wyse on National Education..Thom..New Zealand ..Zoolu Massacre..Coronation 469
ANSWERS.— Papers received .. Popular Hymn..Professor Malden 472

AUGUST.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Our Lord's Temptation [*concluded*] .. Reminiscences of Bishop Hall, No. III..Dodgson on Ripon Questions: with Reply.. Letters from Dr. J. P. Smith; with Reply..M'Hale, not Luther, Schismatical..Affected Reverence for Christianity.."Christening" Ships..Restoration of the Jews..Omissions in Tracts .....473—520
POETRY.— Harvest Home .. Christ our Pattern..Boyhood..The Pavilion..The Three Sons 521
REV. OF—Sermons by A. W. Hare 525
PUB. AFF.—Slave Emancipation..Plumptre's Lord's Day Bill..Anti-Plurality Bill ..Church Discipline Bill..Factory Question..India Idolatry..Beer Shops..Irish Municipal, Poor Laws, and Tithe Bills.. Coronation..... 535
ANSWERS.—Papers received, &c. &c.... 536

SEPTEMBER.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—The Father of Lights..Reminiscences of Bishop Hall, No. IV. [*concluded*] .. Doing Good.. Moral Parallels..Restoration of the Jews ..Religious Indolence..Tract Society's Coronation Tract..Melancthon on Election..Election to Baptismal Justification ..Creed over Communion Tables..Dissenters Conforming .. Gloucester Music Meeting .....537—566
REV. OF—Life of W. Wilberforce [*continued*] 567
OBIT.—The Rev. T. T. Biddulph..... 594
PUB. AFF.— Queen's Speech .. Peace, Negro Apprenticeship, Imprisonment Act, Anti-Plurality Act, and Irish Poor Law..Irish Tithe Composition Act 599
ANSWERS.—Papers received .. Rev. C. Dodgson..Tithes..Dr. Smith 600

OCTOBER.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—The Origin, Instrument, and End of Regeneration.. Aspects of Christianity..Common Sense ..Moral Parallels..Hooker on Episcopacy..Romanist Use of Oxford Tract Doctrines..La Place's Argument against Miracles..Credulity of Religious persons ..Christian Knowledge Extracts from Tyndal..Suppression of Infant Baptism by the Religious Tract Society..Letter from the Rev. C. Dodgson; with Reply ..Noel on Unity..Faber on the Apostolical Succession among the Waldenses.. Evangelical Professions and Worldly Practices..The Fathers on the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture..Sunday Instruction of Families .....601—633
REV. OF—Bp. Bowen's Sermon for Bp. White..Layman's Essays on the Church ..National Church Establishment:—Lectures by Dr. Chalmers; Essays by Roberts and Nicholson; Parochial System, by H. W. Wilberforce; Christian Influence Society .....634—653
PUB. AFF.—Duel.. O'Connell's Agitation ..Encroachments on the Lord's Day .. 664
ANSWERS...Papers received 664

NOVEMBER.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Restoration of the Jews..Tumult at Ephesus.."Our most Religious and Gracious Queen..Confessional of Rome..National Education.. Portable Chalices and Patens..New Argument for the Voluntary Principle.. Lord's Supper after Confirmation .. Dean Swift's Will..Voyage to Loo-Choo ..Statistics of Voluntaryism ..American Testimony to the English Bible..Scripture not intended to teach Physical Science..On the Principles of Dissent ..Stealthiness of the Oxford Tracts:— The Breviary, &c. .....665—714
PUB. AFF.—Review of Political and Ecclesiastical Questions, and of the duties of Christians and Patriots .. Colonial Slavery..Canadas, and Lord Durham's resignation..Ireland: Tithe Act; National Schools..Imprisonment for Debt Act..Criminal Law 723
ANSWERS.—Papers received..The "Layman's" Essays 782

DECEMBER.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—"The Hearer only, and Doer of the Word"..Moravian Mission in South Africa..Latin Lines on the Offerings of the Wise Men..Confessional in the Church of Rome..Oxford Breviary Tract.."Our most Religious and Gracious Queen"."The Redemption of the First-born"..Injudicious Anecdotes in Tracts..On becoming Sponsor for a Child..Modern Impressions of the English Bible..Dangers of Re-action ..729—760
POETRY.—Babe of Bethlehem.. Fading Year..Loom of Time 761
REV. OF—National Church Establishment: —Lectures by Dr. Chalmers; Essays by Roberts and Nicholson; Parochial System, by H. W. Wilberforce; Christian Influence Society..Life of W. Wilberforce .....763—774
OBIT.—Bishop Burgess..... 784

APPENDIX.

REL. AND MIS. COM.—Our Lord's Farewell Discourse..Moravian Mission in South Africa..Spontaneous Animal and Vegetable Production..Presbyterians in Ireland..On Baptism..Translating Baptism by Immersion..Proposed Rail-road Survey of Spontaneous Vegetable Production..Providence of God Illustrated by Facts .. The Romish Confessional.. Apostolical Succession .....793—819
REV. OF—Sermons by Bishop Wilson, Bishop Heber, Rev. B. W. Matthias, Rev. H. Woodward, Rev. H. Melvill, Rev. C. Bradley, and Rev. H. Blunt .. 828
OBIT.—Bishop Burgess 836
PUB. AFF.—..... 838
ANSWERS 838

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 1. JANUARY. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

"THE END OF ALL THINGS." (1 Pet. iv. 7.)

For the Christian Observer.

IT has pleased God to divide time into certain regular portions, measured out by the stated periodical return of days, and seasons, and years. This is a merciful dispensation. It removes that vagueness and indefiniteness—that silent and imperceptible movement which would otherwise accompany the flow of time. It enables us in some degree to ascertain the point, as to this mortal life, on which we stand; and affords certain measures by which accurately to compute the sum of the past, and to calculate, by experience, the probable amount of the portion yet to come. Would men avail themselves of this; would they but sometimes look calmly back upon their past life; see what a moment it appears in the review, yet how full of care and perplexity, anxieties and disappointments; would they look forward to the interval that lies between them and those "threescore years and ten," beyond which (even were life protracted to this extreme length) all is but labour and sorrow; and see how brief the span, yet how pregnant with the seeds of care and misery; such views would tend to wean their affections from things below, and to set them upon things above; and lead them to adopt the language of the patriarch and psalmist, "Few and evil are the days of man! so soon passeth it away and we are gone!"

I have been led into this train of reflection by our arrival at the close of one of these grand divisions of time—at the end of one of its greater portions. We are now closing another year, and the consideration suggests many interesting and profitable topics for reflexion. If we look around us even upon the face of nature—but a few months ago blooming in all the freshness and verdure of spring, in all the beauty of summer, or in the ripe and rich luxuriance of autumn—but now faded, withered, and decayed,—we there view a lively and humiliating picture of the history of man; for "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass:" if we look upon the changes which during the past year have occurred in the state of society in general, or in our own social or domestic circle,—the unexpected death which vacated our own throne, and gave, at its most eventful crisis—shall we say an increased impulse or a new direction to the destinies of Britain? the national convulsions, by which

some have been hurried into eternity,—the political and commercial revolutions, by which others have been hurled from the pinnacle of rank and power, or from the lap of wealth and luxury, into poverty, neglect, and destitution,—the breaking up of families,—the departure, the sickness, the death of friends, with whom we entered upon the year in all the buoyancy of expectation, and all the cordiality of affectionate intercourse: if we look back upon the trials we may have ourselves met with, in pecuniary embarrassments, in disappointed expectations, in bodily sicknesses and infirmities: if we look on to the probable carrying forward of all this, in the "changes and chances," the trials and afflictions, of the coming year: and if we consider the almost certainty that some, who now read these lines in present health and vigour, will not see its close in the land of the living,—such views will bring home with power to our minds the motive by which the Apostle, St. Peter, enforces his precepts in that appropriate and solemn passage (1 Pet. iv. 7) "Be ye sober, and watch unto prayer; for the end of all things is at hand." Those precepts are, Sobriety, Watchfulness, and Prayer:—the two former undoubtedly important in themselves, but still more important on account of the aspect which they bear, and the influence which they exercise upon the third—prayer: and these three precepts are enforced by the shortness of the duration of all below, "Be ye sober, and watch unto prayer; for the end of all things is at hand."

The sobriety here spoken of is by no means to be confined to the common and ordinary acceptation of the term, temperance in food and drink; to a freedom from gluttony and drunkenness, from uncleanness and impurity, and from those fleshly lusts which war against the soul. But all this is necessarily included, and is an essential branch of the Christian's duty. If we would "be filled with the Spirit," we must take good heed to the Apostle's exhortation, and "be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess." If we would invite and detain with us that Divine Visitant who offers to come unto us and make his abode with us, we must not defile with uncleanness and impurity those bodies which are the temples of the Holy Ghost. And if this high motive be not sufficient to influence us, let us remember that God has solemnly declared that "drunkards shall have their portion in the lake that burneth with brimstone and fire for ever:" that "if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy:" that "whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." We should be careful that in no particular we abuse grace unto licentiousness, and render the Gospel "a savour of death unto death," by using its liberty as an occasion unto the flesh, and not as a privileged opportunity of holy self-discipline and self-denial. If any persons consider stated occasional fasting to be inconsistent with the spiritual nature of Christianity, even they should remember that there is a daily, habitual temperance, which is not only perfectly compatible with it, but which is the bounden duty of every Christian. It is true that our Lord declares "It is not that which entereth into the mouth defileth a man," but evidently he must be understood with this limitation, that what "entereth into the mouth" neither oppresses the faculties of the mind, damps the heaven-aspiring ardour of the affections, nor stimulates the evil passions of our corrupt nature. To give particular directions on the subject of temperance in food were impossible. But of this we may be assured, that we have transgressed the lawful use of even the

lawful refreshments of the body, when their use does not leave us in a state—I will not say equally, but still more ready than before—for meditation and prayer. "We should eat to live, and not live to eat." We should nourish the body in order to render it a more active and obedient minister to the soul; and not so pamper and indulge it as to render the soul a slave to its appetites and passions.

But much more than all this is implied in the sobriety here spoken of. It implies not only a freedom from gluttony and drunkenness, but also from the cares of this life—not only a bodily, but a spiritual temperance—not only a due regulation and controul of the desires of the body, but also of those of the mind. We might be temperate in food, yet embruted in the spiritual sensuality, if I may so call it, of selfishness, of covetousness, of earthly-mindedness. We might be temperate in drink, yet intoxicated with pride and ambition, with vanity and the love of popular applause. But the sobriety here spoken of implies a weanedness of affection from all these things; a freedom from anxious and inordinate desire; a curbing of the mind in the too eager pursuit even of legitimate objects; a fulfilment of our ordinary duties, and a prosecution of our lawful business and calling, in a calm, tranquil, unhurried spirit of submissive resignation to the Divine will—a spirit which diligently uses the lawful means, then leaves the issue, contentedly, with God. In a word, to be sober is, in the Apostle's mind, to put the whole heart into that daily prayer to God, "Thy will be done."

The next duty which the Apostle here inculcates is Watchfulness. This too implies a due regulation of the body, as relates to the refreshment of sleep: and in this view it furnishes an useful hint to those who plead that they cannot spare time from their necessary avocations, for reading and prayer. Let such honestly ask themselves whether they could not, without any injury to their bodily health, but on the contrary with much benefit to it, abstract another hour from those now devoted to sleep, for the purpose of devoting it to God and to the refreshment of their souls. But the watchfulness here spoken of is principally of a spiritual nature; a watchfulness over the frame and temper of our minds, and over the circumstances in which we are placed, so far as they are influential upon our spiritual state. It is a watchfulness against the assaults of that wily and powerful adversary who goeth about seeking whom he may devour; who with ever waking vigilance watches each avenue which our sin or negligence may leave open, in order to enter and make a lodgment in our souls. It is a watchfulness against the snares and temptations of a world which lieth in the wicked one, which is at enmity with the blessed God, and of which Satan is "the prince" and "the god:" a world whose friendship is enmity with God; and which, if any man love, the love of the Father is not in him. It is a watchfulness against the solicitations of our own corrupt nature, and especially against that sin which doth most easily beset us. It is a watchfulness against the indulgence of evil tempers, and wandering thoughts, and vain conceits of our own goodness or ability: a casting down imaginations with every high thing which would exalt itself against God in the sanctuary of the heart, and a bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. In a word, to watch is, in the Apostle's mind, practically to offer that daily prayer to God, "Lead us not into temptation."

Such are the two duties of Sobriety and Watchfulness, important in themselves, but still more important as essential preparatives for that great business of the Christian's calling—Prayer. Prayer is the test of man's spiritual state; just in proportion as he prays he is a Christian. Prayer is the very pulse of the regenerated heart; it is the quickening of the Spirit in the new birth—the breath of the life of God in the soul. But when I speak these high things of prayer, I do not speak of the cold, lifeless repetition of a form of words, however sound and orthodox, independent of the spirit and feeling which should animate them. I do not speak of the exercise of the memory, the labour of the understanding, or the swellings of the imagination, however freely, fluently, or fervently poured forth. But I speak of a rising of the whole soul from earth to heaven; a deep sense of the presence of God, and a pouring out of the varied affections into the Divine bosom. I speak of a spirit of penitence, which feels while it confesses itself a miserable sinner; which feels while it declares the burden of sin to be intolerable. I speak of a spirit of humility, which feels itself less than the least of God's mercies; a spirit of dependence, which feels its utter helplessness, and that all it has, and is, and wants, has been, and must ever be, received from God alone; a spirit of confidence, which can trust God for all things, whether pertaining to life or godliness; and which feels it to be a ground of solid comfort and security that all depends upon God rather than upon ourselves. I speak of a spirit of gratitude and thankfulness for God's manifold mercies, "and above all for his inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory;" a spirit of contentment and complacency in His providential dealings with us, and of submissive resignation to His will; a spirit of love, which is the combination of every grace, and in whose pure incense the soul ascends, a whole burnt offering to God. Tempers, and not mere words, constitute prayer. The graces of Christianity are the notes which swell the sacred anthem of praise and prayer, when the breath of Heaven breathes upon, and the finger of God sounds, the chords of the heart. And whether your prayer be the calm effusion of a serene and satisfied spirit, or whether it be the "groanings which cannot be uttered" of strong temptation, and internal struggle, and earnest desire after deliverance; or whether it be the rapt and ecstatic breathings, which it is not possible for man to utter, of a soul elevated in Divine communion, and caught up into paradise by a sense of indwelling God,—in all this, it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.

Such is the prayer to which sobriety and watchfulness minister, or rather of which they are important parts; and which is the first duty and privilege of the Christian. Not that God needs to be informed of our wishes: "He knoweth whereof we are made"—"He understandeth our thoughts long before." He knows not only what we wish, but what we want—what would be really beneficial, and what would be pernicious to us. Nor is it that the heart of God requires to be moved by our petitions and complaints—He "is more ready to hear than we to pray, and wont to give more than either we desire or deserve." But it is to move our own hearts, and not the heart of God, that we may be fit to receive, with safety to our souls, temporal blessings, and capable of receiving spiritual blessings. It is because

that whatsoever we ask in prayer, believing, we have, that God has commanded us to pray, and has promised a blessing to prayer, independent of its re-acting efficacy on our souls. It is to open a channel of communication between man and God, down which spiritual blessings may freely flow, and up which God may attract and elevate the soul. It is that man may see more clearly his own spiritual state, and that the proud rebel may be converted into the humble penitent. It is to keep up in him a sense of his dependence upon that God in whom all fulness dwells; to quicken the appetites of his soul after spiritual blessings, and thus to open his mouth wide that God may fill it. It is that he may unburden his heart of all its cares and sorrows in the bosom of a friend who careth for him—who can be touched with a feeling of his infirmities—who is willing and able to relieve him. It is to invigorate and brighten, by exercise, all his Christian graces—his faith, his hope, his love. It is for those gracious purposes that God has suspended the communication of his blessings on prayer—has said, "Ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you."

But some famishing soul may say, Such prayer were indeed a blessed privilege, but thus I cannot pray; such is too excellent for me; I cannot attain unto it. I enter into my closet and shut to the door, but cannot find there a Father which seeth in secret. I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him; he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him. Coldness and languor freeze and paralyze my soul. The wanderings of imagination dissipate and distract me. Worldly thoughts intrude, and draw down my soul to earth. No motives which the understanding labours to bring before them, can excite my torpid affections. Wearied and disgusted, I hurry over this laborious and unprofitable task; and, half despairing, half hoping that some other effort may prove more successful, I rise unsatisfied, unrefreshed, unbenefited.

But, let me ask, how have you passed the day? Have you been sober and watching unto prayer? Have you practised those duties of sobriety and watchfulness as we have now described them? Have you been collecting materials, from an observation of the circumstances around you, and of the workings of your own mind, out of which to form your prayer? and have you, by a constant endeavour to realize the presence of God, disciplined your faculties and trained your affections to the habit of prayer? If not, it is vain to expect that you can pray. If your affections were deeply interested in some business in which you were engaged; if even your thoughts were intensely occupied about it, would you not find it impossible suddenly to call in your thoughts and affections, so as to fix them upon the perusal of a book which you occasionally took up? And how much more difficult must this be in the case of prayer, which is so utterly uncongenial to all the movements of nature? To pray at all, we must, as the Apostle exhorts us, "pray without ceasing"—"pray always." We must pray habitually, if we would pray actually. We must seek to realize habitually the presence of God, and thus maintain a praying frame of soul. Vestal purity and devotional undistractedness must watch there the heaven-descended fire, and never suffer it to be extinguished in this temple of the living God.

But if you tell me that you have studied to "be sober," and to

"watch unto prayer," and yet cannot pray; I still ask, Have you persevered in prayer? Our Lord has taught us, by a most interesting parable, "that men ought always to pray, and not to faint." And His conduct to the Syrophœnician woman stamps inestimable value on persevering prayer. It was not because the Saviour's heart felt no sympathy with her sufferings, and no desire to relieve them, that to her first petition "He answered her not a word;" that to her second He gave a decided refusal; and that her third was met with reproaches, such as on no other occasion proceeded from His lips of love to an humble suppliant; and which, least of all, were called for by her of whom He himself testified, "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel;" but it was to hold up to us a bright picture of the efficacy of perseverance and importunity in prayer: it was to shew us that where the fault is not in ourselves, and in our want of a due preparedness of mind, if God hides himself, it is but to exercise our faith, that he may strengthen it; to call out our hope and love, that he may increase them; to pass through the furnace, that he may brighten all our Christian graces; to quicken by delay all the appetites of the soul, that he may fully satisfy them. Let us not, then, faint, when perhaps another step will bring us within the borders of the promised land. Let us not shrink from that which, if we are but faithful, will prove a blessing, by exercising, and confirming, and brightening in us the graces of the Divine life. Let us not sink in despondency when God but "waiteth to be gracious."

But remember that prayer is the gift of God; and that when the soul really and spiritually prays, it is not we who speak, but the Spirit of our Father which speaketh in us. Prayer is not a natural science, attainable by instinct or reason, but the breathing of a Divine life in the soul. In our natural state "we know not what we should pray for as we ought;" or, by human teaching knowing it, we revolt from and reject it. The sense of temporal wants or temporal miseries may elicit from the natural heart a cry for relief or deliverance: the ignorance of our spiritual wants, and aversion from all spiritual blessings, silences the voice of spiritual prayer; let, therefore, your first petition be that God will give you a desire to pray; then, grace to persevere in your efforts to pray; then, ask of him that Spirit which helpeth our infirmities; which removes the coldness, the languor, the deadness of our hearts; which opens the eyes of our darkened souls (for "we know not what we should pray for as we ought"), and teaches us to pray. Ask that the Spirit may make intercession *for* you and *in* you. Persevere with that holy importunity which says, "I will not let thee go unless thou bless me," and soon will God reveal *to* you and *in* you, his name and nature—Love. The Saviour will but touch the heart of stone, and tears of penitential love will flow. Lift up the hands that hang down, and soon, with Moses, you will ascend by prayer Pisgah's top, and view the promised land: you will see, with Jacob, that ladder descending from the heavens by which, even while imprisoned in this tabernacle of flesh, you can hold communion with the invisible world.

The motive by which the Apostle enforces these three precepts is this—"the end of all things is at hand." And what motive could be urged more weighty, and which should be more powerful in detaching the affections from things below; in producing watchful vigilance against the snares and temptations of the world, and an earnest desire to open a communication between the soul and heaven. If we con-

trast time with eternity, we might well use this language—"the end of all things is at hand," even though myriads of years were interposed between us and the consummation of all things. But if eighteen hundred years ago the Apostle could adopt this language, still more may we, when every way-mark, which revelation has set up to tell the course of time, indicates that our lot has fallen in the "perilous times" of "the last days." But however this may be, one thing at least is certain, that as the day of his birth is to each the beginning, so the day of his death is to each the end, of all things here below: "we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out." Think, then, what a span of life, even though protracted to its utmost duration, lies between you and the grave. And if you would estimate aright its value, review your past life; read the heads of its history at a rapid glance; and measure, by this moment, the future. Ask yourself seriously, How many of those plans with which I am now occupied, and which time alone could ripen, can be executed; how many of these enjoyments which I now propose to myself can be tasted before I reach that goal where all our thoughts perish? But do the things below, even while they continue to us, and we to them, spread our table with prosperous plans and unmingled enjoyments? Far otherwise. Look round upon the circle of your acquaintances and friends: read the past and present history of each. Do you not see one anxiety removed but by another which has succeeded—perhaps supplanted it? affliction and sorrow chased by affliction and sorrow; as in the stormtost ocean, wave presses upon wave? Read the secret history of your own heart: have you realized the sanguine expectations of happiness with which you entered upon life? Has the world kept the brilliant promises with which it seduced your ardent, unsuspecting, youthful heart? Are you without God and without hope in the world, and are you happy? You are not—you cannot be. Your heart was made for God; and out of God it cannot rest. The aspirations of your soul are boundless; its appetites are for an infinite good, and therefore God alone can fill and satisfy it.

Will you, then, cleave to lying vanities which cannot profit; which an immutable law of the universe is tearing from your grasp, and you from them; which fade in your arms, and perish in the using; on which, even in their best estate, are indelibly stamped vanity and vexation of spirit, and which never fail to pierce the heart that leans upon them? Or will you not rather point the will—that helm of the soul—heavenward? Will you not spread the sails of the affections to catch every breeze that could waft you on your course? Will you not send forth many an aspiration of prayer to spy out the promised land, and bring back rich samples of its fruits and flowers? Then will even trials and sorrows but swell the sails, and speed you to the haven where you would be. They will but cause you to hold more firmly by the anchor within the vail, both sure and stedfast; and will ultimately land you on the peaceful shores of a blessed eternity.

J. M. H.

LETTER FROM THE REV. J. P. SMITH, D.D.; WITH REMARKS IN REPLY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

[We are unwilling to open a new Volume and a New Series with remnants from last year; but as we would avoid, not only the reality, but even the suspicion of injustice, we insert Dr. Smith's letter. A few notes will suffice to explain the matters in discussion to our new subscribers.]

REVEREND and dear sir.—Be not alarmed; I am not desirous of proceeding in a most unwelcome, ungracious, and, I fear, interminable controversy. Only two things do I solicit of you: first, to let me thank you for your kind admission of my letter into the last [that is, the October] Number of the Observer; which, I confess, I had scarcely hoped for; and, secondly, to beg the same courtesy in relation *only to one subject*, to leave which without correction would not only imply a disregard to veracity on my part, but would amount to a confirmation of mistakes on matters of *mere fact*, which are perhaps widely prevalent.

I refer to your Note 8, in page 645.* I could not well have sup-

* Our note, to which Dr. Smith alludes, was the following: "The union with Socinians for the sake of common objects, we thought was too notorious to be questioned; and we are very much mistaken if Dr. Smith himself did not take a prominent share in this alliance—in the triple bond of the Dissenting denominations;—and though that union is now happily broken, yet Dr. Smith long defended it. The late elections, we lament to say, have presented instances of Baptist and Independent ministers plotting with Socinians to oppose the Church of England, and inveighing against the narrow-minded clergyman and Methodist minister who were contending for the national worship of God. Our remark upon the pulpit-intercourse of Evangelical Dissenters with Unitarians, was in allusion to the strange coalition in the Dissenting Orphan Working School, which public opinion has at length forced the Evangelical Dissenters to break up. Mr. J. Clayton, to his honour, took, we believe, an active part in the disruption. The pulpit in question was a Dissenting pulpit; and Socinians, in common with Evangelical Dissenters, were admitted into it. What could the public think of such fraternizing?"

We see nothing in Dr. Smith's letter to make us change our opinion, that the modern Evangelical Dissenters have done ill in uniting, as they too often have, as well with Socinians as with Papists and infidels, in prosecuting what they call "the extension of religious liberty;" but which their own sermons, magazines, newspapers, and ecclesiastical societies avow, means the extermination of all national church-establishments; for that consummation they expressly affirm is involved in the pending question of church-rates. Dr. Smith's statement, that there were no Arians or Socinians in the threefold union during many years after its formation, confirms all that we have so often said upon that subject; our argument being that the Evangelical non-conformists of the days of Howe, and Baxter, and Calamy, would have recoiled from an association which their modern Evangelical successors have strenuously defended. But when we speak of union and fraternization, we do not refer so much to actual compacts or societies, as to the general spirit which Dissenters, differing widely among themselves, have of late shewn in their opposition to the established churches of the land.

posed that you had regarded the late union of the "General Body of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, of London and Westminster," as a "fraternizing with Socinians." That union descended to us from the days of our forefathers; and it arose in the

---

We will exemplify our meaning. The radicals and revolutionists of some parishes, taking the law into their own hands, have decided, not only that church-rates are a grievance which ought to be legally abolished, but that they shall be put an end to by terrorism; just as the lawless banditti of Ireland have prevented the legal payment of tithes; and we owe it, under the merciful providence of God, to the good sense and peaceable feelings of the populace, that the anti-church-rate conspiracy has not in many places led to scenes of confusion and bloodshed; for who could answer for what might be the conduct of an exasperated multitude collected to oppose the levying of a tax, or the sale of goods to defray it, if they could be persuaded by inflammatory harangues that it was unjust, and ought to be resisted with force of arms? While we are writing, a Mr. Murphy and others, in the metropolitan parish of St. Pancras, have been found guilty, by a jury of their countrymen, of the serious crime of forming a conspiracy to obstruct the officers of justice in the legal discharge of their duty in the collection of church-rates. Such is the practical comment; now let us look at the text. Suppose we turn to an anti-church-rate speech of Mr. Hinton, a well known and influential Evangelical Dissenting minister. "I tell ministers," he says, "that if they will not abolish the rate, we will be as unquiet as the Irish"—[cheers]. "I have no pretensions to be like Mr. O'Connell in any other matter"—how modest! and how indicative of the admiration of Mr. Hinton and his friends for that great man!—"but I have no objection to resemble him in this, to stand on the platform and cry to the people of England, Agitate! Agitate!" Mr. Murphy of St. Pancras gave precisely the same advice. Mr. Hinton adds, "If that rate is not abolished in parliament in three years, *it will be abolished out of it*"—an expression which can only be construed to mean *by illegal violence*. If, then, we were to say that Mr. Hinton and Mr. Murphy fraternized in their views of this matter, we do not think our expression would be much too strong. Or if from Mr. Hinton, an individual, we turn to the Eclectic Review—the editor of which mentions among his coadjutors Dr. P. Smith himself, with Mr. Binney and Dr. Vaughan,—we find it urged upon every "conscientious Dissenter" never again to pay church-rates; but to oppose the law of the land after the manner which in Ireland they call "passive resistance;" which was precisely the advice given by the infidels and radicals in St. Pancras: "Let your goods be seized;" and then, when they were to be sold, Mr. Murphy made a speech urging the populace "to pile up heaps of bones" before the doors of those who received goods for rates, and to point them out as they walk the streets. Mr. Murphy did not, we believe, say what by-word was to be used on the occasion, but the Eclectic Reviewers will aid his vocabulary. Those who will not join the conspiracy of passive resistance against the law of the land, are to be taunted as men "who are ready to surrender their allegiance to Christ"—who "would not hesitate to pay a tax for supporting the false prophet in a Turkish mosque, or withhold their contributions, when legally demanded, for the temple of Juggernaut,"—who are supporting a system "as deteriorating to the character of Christianity, and as subversive of its influence, *as any form of paganism under the sun*;" "as unlike Christianity" as "the heathenism of Pekin,"—and whose clergy "are little better than idolaters" (!!) These, says the Eclectic, are "*the views of Dissenters generally*," or at least of "very many of all denominations." When the leading Evangeli-

occasional necessity of communication with the government, particularly after the Revolution in 1688. It should also be remembered, that in its early period the differences of religious sentiment among Dissenters were slight compared with those of modern times. I know not that we could find an Arian, still less a Socinian, among them, till the reign of George I. The only English Socinians of that time, of whom I have any knowledge, were Mr. William Manning, a nonconformist minister of Middleton in Suffolk, and Mr. Thomas Firmin, who lived and died a member of the Church of England.

The objects of that union were—First, *Ordinary:* At an annual meeting to report accessions and diminutions to the membership in each denomination. Second, *Extraordinary:* For the promotion of any work of beneficence in which all the parties can cordially unite. Those which I now remember, within thirty-seven years, are the abolition of the Slave Trade, the opening of India to Christian Missionaries, the relief of the persecuted Protestants in France, and the various measures in our own country for the extension of religious liberty. Third, *Occasional Addresses* of felicitation or condolence to the sovereign; and communications with the ministers of the crown upon any parliamentary measures affecting Dissenters.

Now, permit the question—Could any association for these purposes, and these only, be justly objected to? Are we treated fairly when it is called a "union with Socinians"—an "alliance"— a "fraternizing"—*in a manner* which *must* lead the greater part of your readers to suppose that some acts of worship or sermons were included? To me it appears not more objectionable than the meetings of the Anti-Slavery, the Temperance, the Bible, and other Societies; or, shall I say, the meeting at Sion College of yourself and other *truly* orthodox and evangelical clergymen, with other clergymen whom you believe to be, as much as any Arian or Socinian, opposed to the genuine Gospel of Christ; and opposed too with a far more fearful efficiency?

You say, "Our remark upon the pulpit-intercourse of Evangelical Dissenters with Unitarians, was in allusion to the strange coalition in the Dissenting Orphan Working School, which public opinion has at

---

cal Dissenters thus write, can we wonder that Mr. Murphy thought himself in good company? Surely we did not speak too strongly when we used the word fraternizing; except that Mr. Hinton and the Eclectic Reviewers are greater moral culprits than the ignorant irreligious radicals of St. Pancras, because they ought to know better, and profess to be guided by the principles of that inspired Volume which commands them to pay tribute for conscience sake. Dr. Smith, we feel assured, abhors and detests all such proceedings as much as any churchman can do; and we should be guilty of injustice to him, as well as render a very ungrateful return for the truly Christian temper in which he addresses us, if we attempted to make him responsible for the harsh words of less gentle spirits; but in sad truth we must say, that the close connexion of the Evangelical Dissenters with Socinians (many of whom are Deists under a softer name) in matters affecting what Dr. Smith calls "the extension of religious liberty," has led to that unhappy position of the Independents and Baptists, which is so much mourned over by their fellow-Christians in the established church and among the Wesleyan Methodists; while it is hailed with joy and hope by Papists, Socinians, Infidels, and the scoffers at religion of every name.

length forced the Evangelical Dissenters to break up. The pulpit in question was a Dissenting pulpit; and Socinians, in common with Evangelical Dissenters, were admitted into it. What could the public think of such 'fraternizing?'" p. 646.

Here also I complain of a misunderstanding of the *facts*. The Orphan School was founded in 1760, chiefly by the labours and liberality of an *Arian* minister, the Rev. Edward Pickard. A lecture was established (whether at the beginning or afterwards I am ignorant) in the chapel of the school, on the summer Sunday evenings. Ministers of all the denominations were requested to give their gratuitous services; and so they did, till, two or three years ago, a majority of our party procured the *abolition* of the lecture, as no longer of importance; because Sunday evening lectures abound in the neighbourhood, and because abolition seemed the only way of putting an end to that apparent *fraternizing* to which you have adverted. Yet I do not think there was what could be justly so called. The two (rarely more) Unitarian ministers, *who had at least an equal right with ourselves*, delivered sermons such as those of Seed, Ogden, or Jortin, on their evenings; and a dozen Evangelical men had the remaining evenings. Still I am glad that the arrangement has been abrogated, for the sake of "weak brethren;" but I conceive that it has not been correctly characterized by the Christian Observer. Its proper case of analogy would, in my humble apprehension, be such a supposition as this: In one of the metropolitan churches you have a lectureship, and Mr. Prebendary Sydney Smith holds another: he officiates on one Sunday—you on the following: are you justly chargeable with conferring your sanction upon his doctrines? I reply, most certainly not: instead of blaming you, I should rejoice and be thankful that you were there, administering prophylactics and remedies against anti-Evangelical doctrine.*

I had written about one half of the above in the first week of Octo-

* We lament that Dr. Smith can reproach us with such clerics as his facetious namesake; but we can never admit that the two cases are parallel. We admire Mr. Sidney Smith's divinity as little as we admire his algebra, where he calculates that if a seventh prebendary be added to a chapter consisting of six, each loses one sixth of his patronage; or as we admire his late newspaper letter, in which he says that the establishment of St. Paul's Cathedral consists of a dean, three canons residentiary, and a "stultus ecclesiæ, or regular fool," whose business it is "to fill the newspapers with gossiping falsehoods." Whether that personage is installed into his office, and is paid a large stipend for discharging its duties, or whether he occupies it as an amateur, under the guise of a quondam Edinburgh Reviewer, Mr. Smith does not say; and we drop the allusion lest we should violate our Lord's exposition of the decalogue; but, in all seriousness, the elevation of such individuals to high stations in the church, or even the admission of them into its lowest sacred order, is a cause for deep lamentation and humiliation before God, and fearful is the crime of repaying political services with the shew-bread of the sanctuary. Mr. Archdeacon Bathurst is at this moment vehemently complaining in his memoir of his father, and in a newspaper controversy which has arisen out of it, that the merits of the late prelate—the only bishop, he says, who ever followed the same course in political matters—have been shamefully passed over by his party; and that he (the Archdeacon) himself ought long ago to have been made a bishop, and his father, we presume, an arch-

ber, but the unwelcome character of this contending made me the more readily yield to hinderances, and the paper has lain in my desk, never probably to have been finished, but for the *irresistible demand* made upon me by this month's Christian Observer (December 1837,

---

bishop. Here is an unblushing declaration of a high dignitary of the church, already loaded with honorary and lucrative preferments, to the enjoyment of which he had no special claim but family influence, that the disposal of the most sacred offices ought to be regulated by the secular and sordid considerations of political party. Does Dr. Smith think that we vindicate such opinions or practices? So far from it, we have often expressed our earnest wish that all ecclesiastical patronage were at once severed from courts and cabinets, whatever may be their political addictions, and made subservient only to spiritual purposes; and Dr. Smith himself could not express deeper sorrow than every pious churchman does when unseemly assortments are witnessed within the pale of the national communion.

But granting all this, there is still an essential distinction between unions grounded upon false principles, and which must therefore of necessity be evil, and unions incidentally evil from circumstances which do not arise out of the principles of union. The union of Herod and Pontius Pilate was of the former kind; that of Judas Iscariot with the other Apostles, was of the latter. How often must it be repeated, that if a man of immoral life or unscriptural opinions winds his way into the ministry of the Church of England, he does so only through hypocrisy and falsehood; he procures testimonials of sound doctrine and exemplary life; his whole character is publicly put to the test before his neighbours assembled in the house of God; and he subscribes the stringent formularies of an orthodox communion. Even when he has broken through all these formidable barriers, he is still amenable to ecclesiastical censure and punishment if he offend in doctrine or behaviour; and though practically our discipline most seriously requires a thorough renovation, the theory of it is scriptural, so that it involves no violation of principle. Our good ship has unworthy men in her crew, to the great annoyance of their neighbours; but this does not prove us to be a gang of pirates.

Dr. Smith says that in Sion College "truly orthodox and Evangelical clergymen" meet with others whom they believe to be, "as much as any Arian or Socinian, opposed to the genuine Gospel of Christ." We need only reply, that they meet with none who do not solemnly profess to believe every doctrine of the Apostles' (so called), the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds; who have not set their names to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, which include the essential doctrines which Dr. Smith himself would call "orthodox and Evangelical;" and who do not constantly use a Scriptural liturgy, and keep themselves from any public scandal for which they can be legally convicted of heresy or crime. This, indeed, is saying little; it is not taking the clergy at what they are, but at the worst that Dr. Smith's argument might require; and even then, on this unfair ground, we reply, that there is no compromise of principle, though there is much cause for pain and humiliation, that in the visible Church of Christ the tares are mixed with the wheat. Public bodies can only proceed upon recognized tests, which may be either fraudulently subscribed or variously construed; but the individual members of that body will form their own interior circles, and cannot fairly be made responsible for what they disapprove, and which constitutes no part of the basis of the larger compact. If an Arian or Socinian were a member of Sion College—which we have never heard

p. 774,) in which I am not obscurely charged with EQUIVOCATION and PERJURY. Conscious of integrity, I ought not to sit down under such an accusation. If the persons who have brought it forward had

---

so much as suspected—he must appear there as a perjured hypocrite; he would be known within those walls only as a professed orthodox believer; and if he avowed his heresy he would be expelled from communion with the church from which he had apostatized. It is not for human scrutiny to declare what other doctrines are as "opposed to the genuine Gospel of Christ" as the denial of his divinity and atonement; but the "God-denying heresy" is an aberration from Scriptural truth which can be distinctly marked and provided against; whereas many a man's life and doctrines may be unchristian while his professed creed may not be palpably heretical.

There is one serious evil resulting from the very hostile position in which the Evangelical Dissenters stand towards the Church of England—that it causes unnatural and injurious blendings. The Dissenter is brought into intercourse in his political associations with Papists, Socinians, infidels, and revolutionists; and not a few of the most wise and devout men among our non-conformist brethren are bitterly lamenting the deadening effects of secular controversy upon their own spirits, and upon the general aspect of Dissenting societies regarded as religious bodies. In becoming a Dissenter, a man formerly professed to be thinking wholly of the salvation of his soul; he had little temptation to be a Dissenter, except as he thought this was thereby promoted; but now he is goaded on from day to day about his "religious liberties," which no reasonable person can really believe to be in any danger; and unless he sail far away from the vortex of political strife in which so many of his brethren have been ingulfed, he is in awful hazard of making shipwreck of his faith. To live very near to God unfits men in taste and in feeling, as well as in principle, for the rude intercourse of hustings and tavern-speeches, and "Agitation! Agitation! Agitation!"

And is there no danger to the spiritual purity of the members of the Church of England from the tendency of outward pressure to force them together, rather in secular agglutination, than in sacred union? We believe that there is; and deeply do we lament it. One of the greatest impediments in the way of much internal improvement in the Church of England at this moment, is the fear—a most groundless fear—of weakening its defences against external invaders. "Is it a time," we daily hear it asked, "for the ministers and members of the Church to be arguing about matters within the garrison, when the foe is beleaguering the walls? What an excellent thing it would be if they would all sink their private differences, drop their discussions, freely exchange pulpits, have neutral tracts for their parishioners, set up magazines and newspapers upon the principle that nothing shall be admitted into them which any of the leading divisions of the Church can object to; and then say to the Dissenter, See how indissolubly we are united." We should not dare to be parties to such a compact, because we believe it to be unholy. There may be spiritual union between a Howe and a Leighton, or a Watts and a Beveridge; but there can be none between a mere worldly-minded political partisan and a heavenly-minded churchman. Such strength is weakness; such union is unblessing and unblessed. Let us not, then, ask or care what Dissenters will think or say; but let us act honestly and boldly for God among ourselves; let us not call spiritual apathy brotherly love, or merge any one doctrine of the Gospel to keep up a hollow appearance of union of which the Gospel is not the cement; but to be truly united, let us each seek to have the spirit of Christ in ourselves, and call him most our brother who has most of it.

cited the whole of that part of the answers which I gave to the interrogatories of the Chancery Commissioners, before whom, four and a half years ago, I was several successive days under examination, they would not, I trust—for I think they honestly could not—have represented it as they have done. I have no copy (if I can procure one, I will send to you this part of it,) of that evidence, but I well remember the line of argument which I took, and it was to this purport:

That the body of Dissenters in Yorkshire, to which Lady Hewley belonged, comprehended Presbyterians and Congregationalists, united together in *the same faith* as to Gospel-doctrines; joining together in religious services, particularly the *ordinations* of ministers; and generally so affected toward each other that it is perfectly clear to my mind that Lady H. *intended* to comprehend the necessitous ministers of each class under the term of "Christ's poor and godly ministers."

That the ground of her regard for them was not this or the other mode of church-government and discipline, but the holding and practically applying of the doctrines usually called Calvinistic; and that, for all such purposes as Lady H. contemplated in the direction of her bequests, either of the two descriptions of persons was equally suitable.

That an essential part of the Presbyterian principles referred to what used to be called *the power of the keys;* that is, the determining who shall be admitted to church-communion and retained in it; and the converse, who shall be kept out, or if by error admitted, shall be excluded. By church-communion is understood the participation of the sacraments, especially of the Lord's Supper, and the exercise of discipline and subjection to it.

That the usual, and in almost all cases the only, difference between the old English Presbyterians and their contemporary Congregational brethren, lay in this, that the latter churches exercised the power of the keys immediately, by themselves, at their church meetings; but the former mediately, by their Pastors and Elders as their organs of representation. As to the essence of the matter, I consider these two modes as substantially the same; they are like a man doing an act by himself or by his attorney.

That on another point of ecclesiastical order, the ordination of ministers, the two parties were generally agreed. The Congregationalists (or Independents, but we generally prefer the former name,) of both the past and the present time, equally with the Presbyterians, had and have a solemn service of ordination at the settlement of their pastors; and in the testimonial usually given on such occasions, and signed by the ordaining ministers, who are frequently six, or ten, or more, it is commonly expressed that N. N. was "ordained by prayer, with the laying on of hands;" and when the testimonial is in Latin, it is usually expressed thus:—"eum sacro ministerio consecratum esse, ritu inter ecclesias reformatas usitato; precibus scilicet fusis, manibusque presbyterorum impositis."

That the Unitarians who have, in more recent times, become the occupants of chapels and endowments founded at the close of the seventeenth century and the earlier part of the eighteenth are, in no fair and proper sense of the term, Presbyterians; for the following reasons:—

1. They utterly renounce all power of the keys: they have no churches, or disciplinary watching over conduct, or admission to or

exclusion from communion: what is with them called the Lord's Supper, is avowedly open to any and every person who chooses to come. 2. That they equally reject any ordination of ministers, as before described. But that, on the other hand, on these grounds, and in what I fully believe to have been the intention of Lady Hewley, the Congregationalists of the present day (a very small number only excepted, who decline the laying on of hands at ordination,) are, in a fair and proper sense, Presbyterians: by which I meant that they are such as Lady Hewley contemplated in her bequests.

Now, dear sir, this was my position, and those were the reason to which I rested it before the Chancery Commissioners: and I leave to you and to the readers of the Observer to judge whether I am justly chargeable with *prevarication* and *perjury;* and whether "the Independent Dissenters, being Congregationalists, have no greater right to [Lady Hewley's bequests] than had the Socinian Presbyterians," (page 779), who are not Presbyterians at all.

But who are those "*Orthodox Presbyterians* in the north of England (p. 773) who have so unexpectedly stepped forth, and have succeeded to lead Lord Henley into a determination of a scheme which (I would speak with humility and deference) appears to me to be contrary to equity? There are a number (I believe nearly forty) congregations in Northumberland and the adjacent counties, many of which have long been in a very languishing state, both as to the number of attendants and the evidences of spiritual prosperity. Of these, many have been in the habit of filling their respective pastorates by choosing young licentiates of the Church of Scotland; who readily accept the charge, and hold it till they obtain a presentation to a parish in Scotland. When this felicity arrives, the minister quits his flock beyond the English border, and returns into his native country; and another Scottish licentiate is found to engage in a similar course. There are also some large and flourishing congregations, especially in Lancashire, which have been formed within about fifty years, most of them more recently, having originated in the desires of the numerous Scottish settlers whom the manufactures have drawn thither. The ministers of those churches are usually men of superior talent, and, I trust, of Christian piety. Both these ministers and the former class are avowedly members of the Established Church of Scotland; and their names may be seen in the list of the ministers of that Church, published annually in the Edinburgh Almanack. A much smaller number belong to the *Associated Synod,* or Seceding Church. These are the ministers and congregations who have come forwards as *English* Presbyterians, and whose claim Lord Henley has admitted*.

If, sir, you admit this letter, the length of which I much regret, I shall feel sincerely obliged to you; and I hope never again to be compelled to give you similar trouble. Oh that we may pray and

---

* We have very little to say in reply to these remarks, except what we hope is superfluous,—that we never for a moment thought of charging Dr. Smith with "equivocation and perjury." We certainly did express our surprise that when Lord Lyndhurst gave it as his opinion that Lady Hewley's Presbyterianism was established beyond all contradiction, the Independents put in their claim to her property as being Presbyterians. We did not doubt that Dr. Smith satisfied his own mind that there were grounds on which he and his brethren could claim

labour to counterbalance our deplorable differences, by growing up into HIM in all things, who is the Head, even Christ, and by bearing

---

to be so called; and those grounds he has above specified; but we said, and we repeat it, that we were "not a little startled" when we read in his affidavit that "the term Presbyterian is in a fair, just, and honourable sense, and in accordance with its proper signification, capable of being applied to the generality of English Congregationalists." We were startled, not because we supposed that Dr. Smith either equivocated or was perjured, but at the novelty of the doctrine. We thought of the bitter warfare between the Presbyterians and Independents during the Long Parliament; we thought of the nicer dissensions between the Brownists and the Congregationalists, and of the views of Presbyterianism entertained, not only by the former who were the more strict, but by the latter, as represented by such leaders as Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Shadrach Simson, Jeremiah Burroughs, and William Bridge; we thought of the whole history of the Church of Scotland; and we ran through the narrative of English Dissent; but the more we considered the matter, the more we were astonished; nor does Dr. Smith's present statement abate our wonder. Lord Lyndhurst determined that Lady Hewley was a Presbyterian: Dr. Smith replies, So are we. We do not say that Lady Hewley might not refer to Congregationalists as well as Presbyterians under the expression "Christ's poor and godly ministers;" we were not discussing whether the Presbyterians are the only claimants; we were confining ourselves to two points,—namely; first, that Lord Lyndhurst, whether correctly or not, pronounced Lady Hewley to have been a Presbyterian; and secondly, that the Independents, not resting upon the general description of "Christ's godly ministers," went on to say that they are Presbyterians too. Their holding Calvinistic doctrines in common with the Presbyterians is no argument, for not a few Episcopalians have always held the same. The distinct, the only point, was church-government; and this Dr. Smith gets over (we would not use the expression offensively) by saying that the Independents do by themselves what the Presbyterians do by attorney! If so, to what purpose have been all the altercations between the two bodies during two hundred years? The Church of Scotland, it seems, only does by attorney what the Independents do *per se!* Upon the same principle Dr. Smith might argue that the members of episcopal churches are Lady Hewley Presbyterians too, their bishops being their attorneys.

A considerable portion of Dr. Smith's letter goes to the question, Who are the rightful claimants to the Hewley property; a question which we never pretended to determine, so that we might with great fairness leave out his whole argument. We have spoken negatively of the Socinians that they have no right or equity in that property, either as respects their doctrine or discipline; and we have said that the Independents have no right or equity under their newly-claimed denomination of Presbyterians; but whether they have an equity under the general name of ministers of Christ's holy Gospel, or whether some other body has the equity, we never pretended to decide; or so much as offered a conjecture upon the subject; so that it is not relevant to raise the question in our pages under the guise of a reply to our statements.

With regard to the Unitarians (so called), it was remarked in the Christian Observer, long before the name of Lady Hewley had come before the public in the Chancery suit (see our volume for 1825, p. 557), "Of true Presbyterianism, even as respects matters of discipline, their societies retain nothing but the name; and in point of fact, *except as these endowments are concerned*, the Unitarians are

abundantly and consistently the fruits of righteousness which are by Him to the glory and praise of God! *

Homerton, Dec. 2, 1837. J. PYE SMITH.

---

publicly considered, and it is presumed consider themselves, Congregationalists." In this matter, therefore, we fully concur with Dr. Smith. But then we might repeat nearly the same words, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Independents; for "of true Presbyterianism," which most clearly has relation, not to questions of doctrine, but "to matters of discipline," they have neither the name nor the substance; and "in point of fact, *except as these endowments are concerned*," Congregationalists never call themselves Presbyterians, nor would the public recognize them under that name.

With regard to the third party—the Presbyterians in the north of England, whose claim, Dr. Smith says, the master in chancery (Lord Henley) has admitted—we expressly guarded ourselves from offering any opinion upon their demand; so that there was no reason for Dr. Smith's remarks upon them, which may possibly bring on us the infliction of a reply. We said that they are "representatives of Lady Hewley's principles"—which they are, being both Calvinistic in doctrine and Presbyterian in discipline; but we pointedly added; "We say of *the principles*, for it is not ours to decide the rival claims to *the property*." We were merely discussing some recent proceedings of English Dissenters; and we especially guarded against the presumption of pretending to settle, by an off-hand remark, the merits of an intricate Chancery litigation. But as Dr. Smith impugns in our pages, though very courteously, the decision of Lord Henley, we must say, in reply, that the orthodox Presbyterians in the north of England, inheriting Lady Hewley's principles, both in doctrine and discipline, and being also locally situated in those districts of the kingdom which she specially intended to fertilize by her bounty, appear to us to fulfil the required conditions very fairly; and their present destitution—their "languishing state," as Dr. Smith describes it—Lady Hewley would probably have considered a reason for aiding them, rather than for casting them off. We have nothing to do in this matter with the questions which our reverend correspondent raises concerning their numbers or conduct. We have no wish to interfere with the internal concerns of any body of Dissenters—and the members of the Church of Scotland are such on this side of the Tweed, as much as the Independents;—we speak only of extrinsic facts.

* We earnestly reciprocate these hallowed wishes; and, controversy apart, we can from our inmost souls affirm that we believe this blessed object will be promoted in an especial manner, so far as the appointed use of human instrumentality is connected with spiritual grace, by upholding national churches modelled upon apostolical principles and animated by a Gospel spirit. The body, indeed, of a church, as of an individual, without the spirit, is dead; but in supplying the outward means of grace we may humbly trust that the Divine blessing will not be withheld. If our Dissenting brethren could see it to be their duty not to exterminate, but only to purify and strengthen, our national Zion, gladly would we hail their efforts, even though they might apply the probe deeply, and the caustic with unsparing hand. The Church of England wants not flattery or false kindness; it needs faithful dealing; and we often lament, that being forced to work with the sword in one hand, there is but one left to build up the wall. But defence, in its place, is necessary as well as edification; and though those have the happiest lot who are gathering-in the vintage while their brethren are fencing-in the vineyard, yet both duties require to be performed; and if all controvertists

ON THE DISCREPANCIES OF THE OFFICES FOR CONSECRATING CHURCHES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

You say, in one of your late Numbers, that there is no legally authorized or uniform office for the consecration of churches and burial-grounds, and that there ought to be one, and also for coronations. I admit that there is not an authorized form for consecrations; but there is one which has been customarily used, so that it only wants authority, having already the convenience of uniformity.

M. M.

*** We lamented the want of both; there is neither legal authority nor uniformity; for though it is true that in the year 1712 a form was agreed upon in Convocation, yet as it never received the royal assent it was not enjoined to be observed; and we are not aware that any two bishops use, word for word, the same office, though all adopt in substance this common model, which is very Scriptural and appropriate. Were a Puritan prelate to arise, he might omit any portion or the whole of it, and merely say, "I set apart this church for Divine worship and the administration of the sacraments." On the other hand, a prelate of Archbishop Laud's school might renew the proceedings at St. Catherine Cree; and as fanaticism is one of the most uncontrollable of impulses, refusing to listen to argument, and rejoicing in every opportunity of indulging its addictions in the midst of obloquy and opposition, it is not unlikely that, should some conscientious zealot of that school ever be unhappily raised to the episcopal bench, he will, in spite of the remonstrances of his brethren, enact episcopally some of the fopperies of which we have lately heard so much among certain private presbyters. One uniform prescribed office would prevent any such inconvenience; but in the mean time, as we have no acting convocation, the bishops might agree among themselves to use the form already sanctioned, fixing one standard text; or if they wished to make alterations, at least conferring in common as to what alterations shall be adopted, and abiding by the general decision. Such an agreement would not, indeed, legally or ecclesiastically bind a dissentient brother: nor can we be sure that those deacons or presbyters who so defy Protestant usage, order, and feeling, as to read the daily service kneeling at the communion-table before a cross, with their back to the people, instead of in the reading-desk, would not, if they were bishops, continue to shew their independence, by rejecting the office agreed upon by their brethren, reviving the Catherine Cree ceremonies, or refusing to consecrate a church in which there is not a cross over the "altar,"—a word which is studiously kept out of the office for the occasion, as it is out of the prayer-book,

---

were as calm in their arguments and as tender in their spirit as Dr. Smith, the pain would be less and the profit greater.

Since we concluded the above remarks, we have seen a communication from New York, stating that the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in some parts of America have, of late years, been endeavouring to form a brotherly alliance by exchanging pulpits and other acts of spiritual friendship; but that their differences of opinion are found to be so formidable and irreconcilable, that it is impossible any longer to sustain the compact, which has been accordingly dissolved, and each party is now endeavouring to expose the unscriptural system of the other. What will either portion of these litigants say of the affidavit of English Congregationalists that they are legitimate Presbyterians?

but which they might think necessary to substitute for the alleged Puritanism of "the table." But though some individual possibly might thus act, quoting St. Cyprian to prove that every bishop may do what he sees fit in his own diocese, yet the whole of our present, and probably most of our future, prelates would doubtless use the office as agreed upon; which, besides the seemliness of uniformity, would be a great public convenience, now that so many new churches are springing up throughout the land. When church-building was rare, the inconvenience was not much felt; but of late it has become considerable. We will give an illustration. The writer of these remarks lately attended the consecration of a parochial chapel near London; having with him two forms, both entitled, "The Form of Prayer and Ceremonies used at the Consecration of Churches, &c." The first was a cheap "reprint," recently published in London "to bind up with the Prayer-book," in order, it is said, "to supply a desideratum which has very generally been felt by the clergy throughout the country." This, we understood, is the form used in the diocese of London. The second was the form as lately printed by the Venerable C. Clarke, archdeacon of Oxford, for the use of churchwardens, and "to offer to the congregation assembled on the occasion of the consecration of a church the means of joining readily, heartily, and devoutly, in the prayers and thanksgivings of which this service consists." This form has gone through three editions in three years, so that it must have been very extensively used. It professes to be copied from the form of 1712; only with some alterations "too slight to require enumeration;" so that a modern archdeacon of Oxford may make alterations, without even specifying what they are, in an office solemnly agreed upon, after much deliberation, by both houses of convocation; and his unauthorized formulary may be used in public worship by congregations praying "readily, heartily, and devoutly," and, as they think, according to church uniformity, whereas they are only using an *ad libitum* office.

But in the instance alluded to, neither the London nor the Oxford form sufficed; for though the chapel was near London, it happened to be connected with the diocese of Canterbury, so that a third copy was requisite. All three forms, it is true, are taken from the common exemplar of 1712; but they do not agree, either together, or with the original. The rubrics differ from beginning to end, and the prayers abound in various readings; and there are some prayers in one form which are left out in another. We will transcribe, as a specimen, the first four prayers; giving in Italics the various readings.

LONDON.	OXFORD.	CANTERBURY.
Dearly beloved in the Lord; forasmuch as devout and holy men, as well under the Law as under the Gospel, moved either by the secret inspiration of the *Holy* Spirit, or by the express command of God, or by their own reason and sense of *order and decency* have erected houses for the public worship of God, and separated them from all profane and common uses, *which godly practice hath a manifest tendency to advance the honour of God's holy*	Dearly beloved in the Lord; forasmuch as devout and holy men, as well under the Law as under the Gospel, moved either by the secret inspiration of the *Blessed* Spirit, or by the express command of God, or by their own reason and sense of *the natural decency of things,* have erected houses for the public worship of God, and separated them from all profane and common uses, *in order to fill men's minds with greater reverence for his glorious Ma-*	Dearly beloved in the Lord; forasmuch as devout and holy men, as well under the Law as under the Gospel, moved either by the secret inspiration of the *Blessed* Spirit, or by the express command of God, or by their own reason and sense of *the natural decency of things,* have erected houses for the public worship of God, and separated them from all profane and common uses, *in order to fill men's minds with greater reverence for his glorious Ma-*

LONDON.

name, and to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in his service: let us humbly hope, that our heavenly Father will favourably approve our present purpose, of setting apart this place in solemn manner, *for* the performance of the several offices of religious worship, and let us faithfully and devoutly *pray for* his blessing on this our undertaking.

O Eternal God, mighty in power — of majesty incomprehensible—whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, much less the walls of temples made with hands, who yet hast been graciously pleased to promise *thine* especial presence in whatever place even two or three of thy faithful servants shall assemble in thy name, to offer up their *supplications and their praises to* thee; vouchsafe, O Lord, to be present with us who are *here gathered* together, *to consecrate this place, with all humility and readiness of heart,* to the honour of thy great name; separating it henceforth from all unhallowed, ordinary, and common uses, *and* dedicating it *entirely* to thy service, for reading *therein* thy *most* holy word, for celebrating thy holy sacraments, for offering to thy glorious Majesty the *sacrifices* of prayer and thanksgiving, for blessing thy people in thy name, and for *performing* all other holy ordinances *which may be lawfully solemnized therein.* Accept, O Lord, this service at our hands, and bless it with such success as may tend most to thy glory, and the *salvation of thy people,* through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*

OXFORD,

jesty, and affect their hearts with more devotion and humility in his service; which pious works have been approved of and graciously accepted by our heavenly Father: Let us not doubt but he will also favourably approve our godly purpose, of setting apart this place in solemn manner, *to* the performance of the several offices of religious worship, and let us faithfully and devoutly *beg* his blessing on this our undertaking, *and say,*

O Eternal God, mighty in power, *and* of majesty incomprehensible, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, much less the walls of temples made with hands, *and* who yet hast been graciously pleased to promise *thy* especial presence in whatever place even two or three of thy faithful servants shall assemble in thy name, to offer up their *praises and supplications unto* thee; vouchsafe, O Lord, to be present with us who are *here gathered* together, *with all humility and readiness of heart, to consecrate this place* to the honour of thy great name; separating it *from* henceforth from all unhallowed, ordinary, and common uses, *and* dedicating it to thy service, for reading thy holy word, for celebrating thy holy sacraments, for offering to thy glorious Majesty the *sacrifices* of prayer and thanksgiving, for blessing thy people in thy name, and for *the performance of* all other holy ordinances. Accept, O Lord, this service at our hands, and bless it with such success as may tend most to thy glory, and the *furtherance of our happiness, both temporal and spiritual,* through Jesus Christ, our *blessed* Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*

CANTERBURY.

jesty, and affect their hearts with more devotion and humility in his service; which pious works have been approved and graciously accepted by our heavenly Father. Let us not doubt but he will also graciously approve this our godly purpose of setting apart this place, in a solemn manner, *to* the performance of the several offices of religious worship; and let us faithfully and devoutly *beg* his blessing on this our undertaking, *and say*—

O Eternal God, mighty in power, *and* of majesty incomprehensible, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, much less the walls of temples made with hands, *and* who yet hast been graciously pleased to promise *thy* especial presence in whatever place even two or three of thy faithful servants shall assemble in thy name to offer up their *supplications and their praises to* thee; vouchsafe, O Lord, to be *now* present with us, who are *gathered here* together *to consecrate this place, with all humility and readiness of heart,* to the honour of thy great name, separating it *from* henceforth from all unhallowed, ordinary, and common uses, dedicating it *entirely* to thy service, for reading *therein* thy *most* holy word, for celebrating thy holy sacraments, for offering to thy glorious Majesty the *sacrifice* of prayer and thanksgiving, for blessing thy people in thy name, and for *the performance* of all other holy ordinances *that may now or hereafter be lawfully solemnized therein.* Accept, O Lord, this service at our hands, and bless it with such success as may tend most to thy glory, and the *furtherance of our happiness both temporal and spiritual*

LONDON.	OXFORD.	CANTERBURY.
		through Jesus Christ our *blessed* Lord and Saviour. Amen.
Regard, O Lord, the supplications of thy servants; and grant, that *whosoever* shall be dedicated *to* thee in this house by baptism, may be sanctified *by the* Holy *Ghost*, delivered from thy wrath *and eternal death*, and *being made a living member* of Christ's Church, *may* ever remain *in* the number of thy faithful and elect children. *Amen.*	Regard, O Lord, the supplications of thy servants; and grant, that *whoever* shall be dedicated *to* thee in this house by baptism, may be sanctified *with the* Holy *Ghost*, delivered from thy wrath *and eternal death*, and *received as a living member* of Christ's Church, *and may* ever remain *in* the number of thy faithful and elect children. *Amen.*	Regard, O Lord, the supplications of thy servants, and grant that *whosoever* shall be dedicated *unto* thee in this house by baptism, may be sanctified *by thy* Holy *Spirit*, delivered from thy wrath, *received into the ark* of Christ's church, *and* ever remain *among* the number of thy faithful and elect children. Amen.
Grant, O Lord, that they who *in* this place shall in their own persons renew *the* promises and vows made *for them by their sureties* at their baptism, *and thereupon be confirmed by the bishop, may continue thine for ever; and being preserved in the unity of thy church, may daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until they come to thine everlasting kingdom. Amen.*	Grant, O Lord, that they who *in* this place shall in their own persons renew *the* promises and vows made *by their sureties for them* at their baptism, *and thereupon be confirmed by the bishop, may receive such a measure of thy Holy Spirit, that they may be enabled faithfully to fulfil the same, and grow in grace unto their lives' end. Amen.*	Grant, O Lord, that they, who *at* this place shall *in* their own persons *undertake to* renew *their* promises and vows made *by their Sureties for them* at their baptism, *may be enabled faithfully to fulfil the same, and grow in grace to their lives' end.* Amen.

We do not discuss the merits or demerits of these various readings, but we lament the discrepancy. Next month we may attend another consecration at which all the three preceding forms are useless;—and, indeed, worse than useless, as the attention is very painfully distracted when the service read does not correspond with the written form in the hands of the worshippers, many of whom probably think that the officiating prelate is introducing his own extempore emendations. It were better to have an entirely different service, than tetraplas and hexaplas of the same.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF EXTEMPORE PREACHING.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It has occurred to me that much good might arise if a small space of your very excellent publication were devoted to the consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of what is commonly termed extempore preaching. This subject was discussed in some of your former volumes, but a new generation has since arisen, and the commencement of a fresh series of your work will furnish opportunities for reviving the consideration of many questions which are, to the full, as interesting and important now as ever they were; of which this is one.

It must be admitted that no universal rule can be laid down: for while one clergyman, from timidity, or a nervous constitution, may find it impracticable to deliver a sermon to his congregation unless he

has it all written out before him; another may be unable, from defective sight, to read impressively; and a third may find the act of writing so laborious and burdensome, that he could not keep up with the demands of his pulpit.

But, leaving such cases as these out of the question, whilst I believe that there are some ministers who would preach better if they wrote out and read their discourses, I am convinced that there are many others who would be far more useful and efficient preachers, if they were to deliver them extemporaneously. When, however, I speak of extemporaneous preaching, I do not mean the enunciation of a sermon which has not been duly prepared; and assuredly no minister who feels the weighty responsibility of souls, would habitually address his people without having maturely considered the subject to be brought before them. But this may be done without the whole being committed to paper. The general heads and outline used at the bar and in the senate are found to secure sufficient precision in reasoning, and accuracy of language; and slight defects in these matters are surely of but little moment in the pulpit, where, so far as human instrumentality is concerned, a clear and vivid exhibition of truth, and a faithful and searching appeal to the heart and conscience, are mainly required.

Nearly all the ministers of the various Dissenting denominations preach in this manner, and many of them deliver admirable discourses: but clergymen of the Established Church, taking them in the aggregate, have received a far more liberal education, and their literary attainments being consequently of a higher order, they would, if accustomed to the practice, be far better able to deliver extempore sermons, free from any glaring faultiness of diction. I do not know a single instance of a clergyman who preaches extemporaneously, who does not preach good and useful sermons, in the truest sense of that expression.

The reasonableness of a preference for extemporary preaching, will, I think, be apparent, if we consider the respective advantages of both methods. A written discourse undoubtedly secures superiority in certain respects, and there are some subjects which require this more exact mode of preparation. In a written sermon the statements will usually be more clear and explicit than those of an extemporary discourse; the arguments more logical; the reasoning more acute; the division and arrangement of the subject better managed; more to the purpose will be said in fewer words; and the language will be more chaste, elegant, and finished. The advantages of extemporary preaching are confessedly in the delivery: a discourse thus spoken will generally have more of what is called unction; it will be characterized by more earnestness, and will therefore produce a greater effect upon an auditory; the attention is less likely to be distracted, and will probably be riveted upon the discourse and the preacher; whose remarks, for that reason, will be better understood, a larger measure of interest will be excited, and a more permanent effect produced.

The advantages derivable from the former practice would certainly be highly prized by a learned and critical audience: but as the great majority of the persons who compose our congregations are neither learned nor critical, these advantages are lost upon them. But both classes will be able to appreciate the merits of a well-delivered discourse; and will find, especially the latter, that they can without effort listen to it with attention, and may probably bear away much matter for after meditation.

There are, I am aware, many clergymen who read their sermons extremely well; so well indeed, that to the ear they seem rather to be speaking than reading; but in admiring what is a near approach to the extempore manner, we acknowledge its superiority, so far as effect is concerned.

I am not unmindful of the great improvement in composition which is attainable by means of writing; but an extemporary preacher is not precluded from this salutary exercise, either after a sermon has been preached, or on other occasions; but I would not recommend him to write out a sermon and deliver it memoriter—which is probably the worst, as well as most laborious, of all the modes that can be adopted.

I do not add the saving of time which may be gained by extemporary preaching, because the question at issue is, which of the two systems, considered in itself, is to be preferred: but I may remark, that much of the time spent in working up highly finished discourses, might be better employed by a parochial clergyman in ascertaining and meeting the peculiar circumstances of his parishioners; in visiting the sick; and, with all the simplicity of cottage lectures, instructing the ignorant. It is not that the clergy may titilate the public ear, or acquire vain popularity as pulpit orators, that I would urge a more general adoption of the practice of extemporary preaching; but because I believe they will thereby be rendered more efficient and "able ministers;" that they will more frequently find that "their labour is not in vain in the Lord;" and will more signally promote the glory of God, and the salvation of men.

A. B.

*** Our own opinion, as we have often said, inclines strongly, as a general rule, though it admits of many exceptions, to written sermons; but we leave the discussion to our correspondents. The case of the Bar and the Senate is not quite analogous to that of the Pulpit. Mr. Burke, after making some speech at the India House more animated than judicious, remarked to a relative of the writer of this note; "I was warm, and I do not pretend to justify all I said; but the general impression which I intended to leave was right." This applies to not a few Bar and Senate speeches; but a clergyman could not answer to God or man for unguarded words, even where the general scope was scriptural. There are only a comparatively few barristers or senators (not one to the ratio of every hundred clergymen) who succeed in speaking well; and even of these, many could not constantly deliver extemporaneous well-sustained moral addresses corresponding to sermons. The circumstances are very different, as daily experience proves. There are many very valuable and excellent remarks on the composition and delivery of sermons in two works lately published—namely, "Ecclesiasticus Anglicanus," by the Rev. W. Gresley, of Lichfield; and the reprint by the Rev. J. Jones, of Liverpool, with Preface and Notes, of Dr. Porter's "Lectures on Preaching."

THE ARCHBISHOP OF COLOGNE AND THE RELICS AT AIX-LA-CHAPELLE.

For the Christian Observer.

THE banishment of the Archbishop of Cologne from his diocese, by the king of Prussia, has excited much attention, and may lead to some grave considerations respecting the position in which the popish

hierarchy stand towards the civil power under Protestant governments. The immediate cause assigned for the archbishop's removal, is his having refused to permit the marriages of Roman Catholics with Protestants; which, if it were the only cause, we should say, is to the honour of his consistency as a bishop of a church which regards Protestants in much the same light as Turks or pagans; though it is still a serious question how far Protestant governments are bound to permit the agents of Rome to exercise an authority, which, though called spiritual, is made practically to interfere with all the civil and political relationships of life; so that a king is but half a king where the authority of a Romanist bishop is legally acknowledged; and indeed, where that authority is only titular, not legal, a Roman Catholic pays but a divided and hollow allegiance to a Protestant monarch. The conduct of the Archbishop of Cologne seems to have been marked by that spirit of bigotry and intrigue, and that love of domination, which have characterised the papal hierarchy in all ages and countries; and which, though often kept in check by worldly prudence or external pressure, are ever ready to break out where these restraints are removed, or where fanaticism overcomes them. The exiled archbishop's metropolitan city of Cologne is amply furnished with those delusive attractions which render popery so dangerous to superstitious minds, especially with what are called sacred relics. But does the archhishop himself believe that the sculls which are exhibited in his cathedral in gorgeous shrines of silver, gold, and precious stones, "for the edification of the faithful," really belonged to the wise men who came from the East to worship the infant Saviour? When he reverently bows before their pretended tomb, or counts the money that accrues from the deluded multitudes who resort to worship at it, does he credit the fraudful tradition which replenishes his coffers? Must he not secretly scoff at the folly of the votaries of these pseudo kings of the East, Melchior, Caspar, and Balthasar?—for Popery loves the details of mendacity,—numbers, names, and circumstances giving an air of authenticity to a gainful fable. And what does he think of what Mr. Southey, in his Book of the Church, calls "the hugest fraud of this kind that ever was practised;" the fraud of raking up the contents of a whole cemetery, and lining a church with them, under the pretence that they are the bones of St. Ursula and her eleven thousand nuns—British virgins bound from Cornwall to be married in Armorica, carried by tempests up the Rhine to Cologne, there martyred by an army of Huns under Attila; and their remains deposited in his grace's good city, whence more relics of them have been treasured up or sold, during a succession of ages, to deluded pilgrims, and religious houses and churches, than, we had almost said hyperbolically, would replenish Père la Chaise, and a Memphian pyramid to boot.

Mr. Southey, we have said, considers the Cologne fraud of the bones of St. Ursula and her eleven thousand nuns, at Cologne, "the hugest that was ever practised;"* and if he means geometrically, we agree

* We are glad to see a new and improved edition of Mr. Southey's work in one volume, at a reduced price. We mentioned in our review of it, when it was first published, some important particulars, in which we do not concur in opinion with the author; but the work contains a large mass of highly valuable and interesting matter. While it is in our recollection we will avail

with him, but morally, some of the fabricated relics in the archbishop's neighbouring city of Aix-la-Chapelle, are, if possible, even greater, since they indicate an awful degree of profaneness, having relation to the human nature of our Divine Lord himself. To exhibit for

---

ourselves of some remarks from it, upon relics, requesting the reader to observe how Mr. Southey traces up this fraudulent superstition of Rome to that fruitful source of error, the setting up "Tradition, or the unwritten word." Her Majesty's Laureate will have need to render some explanation to his brother minstrel, the professor of poetry at Oxford, for attributing only to "heretics," "pharisees," and "papists," the doctrine that "some things have been revealed, which were not committed to writing, but were orally handed down." Mr. Southey says: "That authority, to which the Church could lay no claim for the purity of its members, it supported by its arrogant pretensions, availing itself of all notions, accidents, practices, and frauds, from which any advantage could be derived, till the whole monstrous accumulation assumed a coherent form, which well deserves to be called the mystery of iniquity. The Scriptures, even in the Latin version, had long become a sealed book to the people; and the Roman See, in proportion as it extended its supremacy, discouraged or proscribed the use of such vernacular versions as existed. This it did, not lest the ignorant and half-informed should mistake the sense of Scripture, nor lest the presumptuous and the perverse should deduce new errors in doctrine, and more fatal consequences in practice, from its distorted language; but in the secret and sure consciousness, that what was now taught as Christianity was not to be found in the written word of God. In maintenance of the dominant system, Tradition or the Unwritten Word was set up. This had been the artifice of some of the earliest heretics, who, when they were charged with holding doctrines not according to Scripture, affirmed that some things had been revealed which were not committed to writing, but were orally transmitted down. The Pharisees, before them, pleaded the same supposititious authority for the formalities which they superadded to the Law, and by which they sometimes superseded it, 'making the word of God of none effect,' as our Saviour himself reproached them. And upon this ground the Romish Clergy justified all the devices of man's imagination with which they had corrupted the ritual and the faith of the Western Church.

"One of the earliest corruptions grew out of the reverence which was paid to the memory of departed Saints. Hence there arose a train of error and fraud which ended in the grossest creature-worship. The prayer which was preferred with increased fervency at a martyr's grave, was at length addressed to the martyr himself; virtue was imputed to the remains of his body, the rags of his apparel, even to the instruments of his suffering; relics were required as an essential part of the Church furniture: it was decreed that no Church should be erected unless some treasures of this kind were deposited within the altar, and so secured there, that they could not be taken out without destroying it: it was made a part of the service to pray through the merits of the Saint whose relics were there deposited, and the priest, when he came to this passage, was enjoined to kiss the altar.

"There is, unquestionably, a natural tendency in the human mind toward this form of superstition. It prevailed among the Greeks and Romans, though in a less degree: it is found among the Eastern nations; and the Mahommedans, though they condemned and despised it at first, gradually fell into it themselves. But no where has it been carried to so great a length as in the Roman Church. The Clergy, presuming upon the boundless credulity of mankind, profited by it in those ages with the utmost hardihood of fraud, and with a success at which they themselves must have sometimes been astonished.

"At one time relics or entire bodies used to be carried about the country and exhibited to the credulous multitude; but this gainful practice gave occasion to such scandalous impostures, that it was at length suppressed. What was still encouraged is sufficiently disgraceful to the Romanists. The bodies of their saints are even now exposed in their churches: some dried and shrivelled, others reduced to a skeleton, clothed either in religious habits, or in the most gorgeous garments...a spectacle as ghastly as the superstition itself is degrading! The poor fragments of mortality, a scull, a bone, or the fragment of a bone, a tooth, or a tongue, were either mounted or set, according to the size, in gold and silver, deposited in costliest shrines of the finest workmanship, and enriched with the most

gain, under religious pretences, a spurious relic of an alleged saint, with consciousness of the fraud, is indeed a crime of black dye; but there is an aggravation of irreverence in trafficking with the pretended flesh and blood and cross and vestments of the incarnate Redeemer.

The exhibition, for alleged pious, and certainly gainful, purposes, of pretended relics, under the sanction of the Archbishop of Cologne, and other Romanist priests and prelates, with the pope at their head, indicates either a degree of superstitious credulity, not exceeded by that of the worshippers of Juggernaut and the feathered idols of the South Sea; or a deliberate system of jugglery, far more culpable than ordinary swindling or commercial forgery, since it affects a sacred character, and mocks God while it deceives and defrauds man. This may seem an uncharitable alternative; but we can discern no medium; for the hierarchy who encourage such practices, and build their fortunes by them, must be either deceiving or deceived,—fanatics or impostors, debased in understanding, or hardened in heart.

The celebrated town of Aix-la-Chapelle is at all times a place of extensive resort, not only for its baths and various amenities, but still more for its fictitious hallowed relics; especially at the septennial exhibition of them, when the votaries of Popish credulity gather together in vast multitudes, from distant provinces and countries, to gaze on the spurious wonders, and to obtain the pardon of their sins and divers benefits beyond the grave, which the pope promises to those who make a devout pilgrimage to worship these fabulous gewgaws. We have in our hands a copy of the official guide-book, issued for the occasion, together with an account of the services, or rather mummeries, used at this juggling festival. It is printed in French, under the express sanction of the ecclesiastical authorities, at the head of whom is the Archbishop of Cologne, and is notified as "being examined and approved by the Vicar-General." It is entitled "The Treasure of Aix-la-Chapelle; or a short description of the holy relics, which were collected by the most glorious emperor Charlemagne, and forthwith placed in the cathedral of our Lady of Aix-la-Chapelle, where they are preserved, and publickly exhibited once in seven years to the veneration of the faithful."

---

precious gems. Churches soon began to vie with each other in the number and variety of these imaginary treasures, which were sources of real wealth to their possessors. The instruments of our Lord's crucifixion were shown, (the spear and the cross having, so it was pretended, been miraculously discovered), the clothes wherein he was wrapt in infancy, the manger in which he was laid, the vessels in which he converted water into wine at the marriage feast, the bread which he brake at the last supper, his vesture for which the soldiers cast lots. Such was the impudence of Romish fraud, that portions were produced of the burning bush, of the manna which fell in the wilderness, of Moses's rod and Samson's honeycomb, of Tobit's fish, of the blessed Virgin's milk, and of our Saviour's blood! Enormous prices were paid by sovereigns for such relics; it was deemed excusable, not to covet merely, but to steal them; and if the thieves were sometimes miraculously punished, they were quite as often enabled my miracle to effect the pious robbery, and bring the prize in triumph to the church for which it was designed. In the rivalry of deceit which the desire of gain occasioned, it often happened that the head of the same Saint was shown in several places, each Church insisting that its own was genuine, and all appealing to miracles as the test. Sometimes the dispute was accommodated in a more satisfactory manner, by asserting a miraculous multiplication, and three whole bodies of one person have been shown; the dead Saint having tripled himself, to terminate a dispute between three churches at his funeral! The catacombs at Rome were an inexhaustible mine of relics."

The preface begins as follows: "In all ages, Christians have regarded relics as precious pledges of Divine protection against their enemies, as well internal as external. This is generally acknowledged: that which relates specially to the relics preserved in the cathedral church of Aix-la-Chapelle is founded on ancient historians, and the fathers of the Church." Then follow some absurd fabulisings of Nicephorus, with scraps of the "highly beautiful discourses" of "St. Germain and St. Euthimius," patriarchs of Constantinople, upon relics. But modern Aix-la-Chapelle is not to be outvied by the metropolis of the Eastern church in the dark ages, for though these "fathers" boasted of possessing "the girdle of the Virgin Mary," and "the swaddling clothes of her dear Son," yet the Archbishop of Cologne and his friends declare that "What these two holy personages preached to the inhabitants of Constantinople in honour of its relics, we may much more assert of those in the cathedral of our Lady of Aix-la-Chapelle; which has the honour of possessing not only the Virgin Mary's girdle, but that also of her dear son Jesus Christ our Saviour; not only of possessing the swaddling clothes which enveloped the man-God, but moreover the napkins which were bound round him on the cross, and on which are still seen the drops of blood which he shed; and besides these a great number of ancient relics, as for instance, some of St. John the Baptist, and of several apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins." It is added that "These precious objects of faith and devotion" produce various blessed effects; one of which is that "they guarantee to us the special grace and powerful intercession of those to whom they belonged," and this, it is added, is why "sacred relics are placed in all altars," and exhibited on solemn occasions to the public veneration; for a stock, it seems, is never wanting when required. It is painful to us to transcribe such mockeries of sacred things; but popery needs to be exposed to the light of day. Do the archbishop of Cologne and his brethren really believe these things, from which their treasury is so richly replenished, or do they not? Are they more knavish or fanatical?

The first chapter—a most necessary, but a most unsatisfactory one—is entitled "Of the Authenticity of the Relics of Aix-la-Chapelle; and the way in which they came there." The general proofs, it is said, of the authenticity of relics are ancient documents, witnesses, the approbation of ecclesiastical authorities, and that most admirably flexible of all testimonies—oral tradition. All these, of course, are made to unite in the Aix-la-Chapelle case, together with ten centuries of actual possession, "so that," it is added, "there is no need of ulterior proofs;"—that is, whatever was believed in the darkest ages, must of necessity be true. But to make surety doubly sure, the spiritual authorities of the arch-diocese of Cologne go on to relate how Charlemagne became possessed of such rare and unique treasures; some of which were presented by the patriarch John of Constantinople; some by the emperors, and some "by the king of Persia!!" for—mark the naïveté of the reason—all these illustrious personages "being anxious to cultivate the friendship of this powerful monarch, and knowing his attachment for objects consecrated by piety, sent him these holy relics as presents; and being transported by a special manifestation of Divine providence from the country of the infidels into ours, they brought with them salvation and the blessings of heaven."

Charlemagne, it is added, was so delighted with these treasures, that he gave in return vast stores of such trash as silver and gold; so that "the Christians of the East regarded him as their principal benefactor." The market proving so good, monks and pilgrims from the Holy Land vied with each other in bringing the credulous king something old and rare; and very probably some Turks' sculls and bones found their way to Europe, labelled with the names of saints and martyrs; and Jews themselves, we doubt not, were quite willing to take a part in so lucrative a traffic. If the memorialists were writing ironically, they could scarcely use language more sarcastic than that which they employ, in pretended gravity, to beguile the unwary. They say, that the Greek emperors, "*in order to gain his friendship,*" sent him various relics; that the empress Irene, "*wishing to marry him,*" sent him some; and, in a word, "his extraordinary piety and his love for sacred objects being well known, most important relics were sent him from Palestine, from the East, from Rome, from Italy, from Africa, and from Spain; which he distributed to all the collegiate churches and cathedrals which he caused to be built; but especially to that of our Lady of Aix-la-Chapelle." We pity the credulity of Charlemagne; the difference between whom and the modern popish hierarchy is this, that he honestly paid vast sums for the trash, whereas they jugglingly pocket larger sums for exhibiting it; or, more probably, for exhibiting the ofttimes renewed articles, which have been substituted in its place.

The second chapter is upon "the grand relics;" which are four in number; but it is especially added that "the little relics" are not of less value, and are so called only because they are less in size than the grand ones; so that whereas the latter are exhibited from a lofty gallery, the former are brought nearer to the wondering and adoring spectators. We will proceed to describe the whole assortment of trumpery (tromperie), but omitting those allusions to Scripture which are mixed up with the official account; yet even then, it is impossible to enumerate some of the articles without painful reluctance, lest the very mention should awaken irreverent associations. Protestant travellers often speak with playful levity of what should rather be exposed with sorrowful reprehension, as if the trickeries of the church of Rome were an excellent jest instead of a fearful crime. Still they ought not to be concealed. The exposure of the sale of indulgences led the way to the Protestant Reformation; the recent intimations, though half veiled, and in modest phrase, of the licentiousness of Dens and the confessional, have caused many Protestants—and we would hope some Romanists—to consider what Scripture has said of the Mother of abominations; and a faithful description of relic-fraud and relic worship (not as they existed in the dark ages, or even in modern Spain, or Italy, or among the rude peasantry of Ireland; but as they are seen in such celebrated places as Cologne or Aix-la-Chapelle—places of familiar resort by Protestants, and in the very centre of those countries in which popery received some of its earliest and deepest wounds) may be of some service in the common cause. We propose, therefore, devoting another paper to the subject; for the present we will merely copy from the official record before us, the items of the four grand relics at Aix-la-Chapelle, with a short specimen of the prayers and exhortations used at the pompous ceremonial of the septenary exhibition of them.

The qualification for seeing the sacred relics is, that the worshipper shall be "in a state of grace;" for which end, say the directors of these ceremonials, he must come to confession, and "acknowledge in these holy relics the mysteries of our faith." The word "our," namely popish, is here very appropriate. Pope Leo III., it is added, accorded, at the earnest request of Charlemagne, plenary indulgence to all persons who should visit these sacred treasures with devotion; for which purpose the visitor is "to render himself worthy by all sorts of good works and the holy communion."

After the assembled multitude have silently offered a prayer "for grace so to visit the holy relics of Christ and his saints with gratitude and *devotion* that they may deserve to see him with all his saints in eternity," the first relic is solemnly announced with much pomp, as follows: "We are about to shew you the holy garment in which the Virgin, the mother of God, was clothed, when she brought into the world Jesus Christ, true God and true man." During the exhibition of this article—which is a garment with sleeves, made, as the authorised account expressly states, of white *cotton* cloth!!—a prayer is offered, which commences thus, "O Lord Jesus Christ, who, after thou hadst clothed thyself with our mortality, didst appoint, through thy servant Charles, that the garment of thy ever-blessed mother should be here preserved, we earnestly pray thee, that under her holy protection," &c. &c. Do the archbishop of Cologne and his clergy really offer this prayer in sincerity? Do they really believe that the inhabitants of Judea wore muslin or calico two thousand years since? This relic is unfolded for exhibition, the others being shewn folded. The people are not left ignorant that it most convincingly proves what Nicephorus and Epiphanius assert, "that the Virgin Mary was a tall woman," the garment being about "five feet and a half long." After the above prayer, the congregation offer up the first ten rosaries.

The most reverend, right reverend, or reverend, exhibitor then proceeds: "We shall now shew you, secondly, the holy swaddling clothes in which our Lord Jesus Christ was wrapped up on the evening of Christmas day." Then follows a prayer to the Saviour, in which he is addressed as having left his church these relics of his birth as a memorial of his perfect humility; the priest adding, "grant that *by their virtue* we may be delivered from the bands of our sins," &c. Then follow the second ten rosary prayers. These vestments are described as being "of a deep yellow colour, as coarse as sacking, but woven."

"We shall now shew you," continues the officiating priest or bishop, "the linen upon which John the Baptist was beheaded, and which is covered all over with marks of his blood." It is fine linen, bound around with a ribbon. Then follows a prayer in which God is thanked for his great mercy in causing this sacred relic to be deposited at Aix-la-Chapelle; so that throughout, not content with deceiving men, these jugglers profanely appeal to God to attest the truth of their falsehoods.—The third ten rosaries follow.

Fourthly, the officiator announces: "We will now shew you the linen cloth with which Jesus Christ our Saviour was girded upon the cross." Then follows a bidding-prayer for the necessities of Christianity, the propagation of the apostolical and Roman Catholic faith, for the Pope and his cardinals, for the king of Prussia, the royal family, the nation, the authorities spiritual and temporal, the archbishop of

Cologne, the chapter, the town, the pilgrims, and the departed faithful. The Lord's prayer, with a Hail Mary, and the benediction, conclude the solemnity. This exhibition is repeated daily from the tenth to the twenty-fourth of July every seventh year. Among the tricks for money-making, one is that the four great relics being always on these festivals folded in fresh silks, the old ones are cut into pieces and disposed of; nominally as presents, but not of the most disinterested kind. They are doubtless highly prized by deluded Romanists, as being endued with extraordinary virtues, from having touched the raiment of our Lord, and of her who was blessed among women, and who, if Saints in heaven could feel pain, would feel no little in seeing the delusions wrought in her name.

It may be said, that the church of Rome does not make the belief in any particular relic an article of faith; so that theoretically a man might live and die "a good catholic," without believing such prodigies as that angels transported the Virgin Mary's house from Nazareth of Gallilee to Loretto:—or that the coloured fluid exhibited in a bottle in various places, and which the worshipper discerns or not, according as he is in mortal sin or in a state of grace—in other words, as the priest turns the translucent or the opaque side of the bottle towards him—or in other words still, as he pays an adequate fee or otherwise—is really a portion of the blood shed upon Mount Calvary for our salvation:—or that the theatrically tricked-out Madonnas which open and shut their eyes, and bow their heads, do so miraculously, according as the blessed Virgin Mary is pleased or otherwise, and not as the fee-collector, who secretly pulls the wires, is so. Now we admit that the authenticity of any particular relic is not absolutely an article of faith; though practically a Romanist would be accounted a secret infidel, who was known to doubt the popular tales, more especially as many of the most gross of these impositions have been legitimated by the pope himself, and such lying wonders are the very staple of the lives of the pseudo saints of the Romish calendar, and are pretended to be regularly proved by authentic depositions and documents in a solemn court of beatification or canonization. Even the Oxford tract, No. 71, (which, as Mr. Newman so zealously defends it, while he denies it to be Dr. Pusey's, we conclude is his own,) says, in its arguments "against Romanism," but which are rather an artful apology for some of its worst principles, and a covert attack upon those of the Protestant reformation, that "the Tridentine decree, in teaching that *it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints,* and that *the images* of Christ and the blessed Virgin, and the other saints, should receive due honour and veneration," uses words which "*go to the very verge of what could be received by the cautious Christian, though possibly admitting of an honest interpretation.*" Now, if even an Oxford tract writer admits that to say that "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints," whether Saint Loyola or Saint Laud, Saint Gregory or Saint Ken, and to honour and venerate their images, is going to the verge (not, observe, beyond it) of what should be received by the cautious Christian, though possibly it admits of an honest interpretation, and therefore needs not, we suppose, be much scrupled at by plain, unlettered Christians, who are not of a very cautious temperament; if, we say, even an Oxford tract writer, who disclaims being a Protestant, admits that the avowed doctrines of Rome in this matter stand rather too near the edge of scriptural doctrine, and that the practice

often actually falls over it, assuredly avowed Protestants may feel quite sure that they do not violate either truth or charity, in making the church of Rome both doctrinally and practically responsible for these superstitions. For the deluded multitudes who assemble to kneel before the relics at Cologne or Aix-la-Chapelle, reverently believing them to be genuine, and that their visit to them will procure a full pardon of all their sins, for which the blood of Christ is not again plenarily available after baptism, we feel the deepest emotions of Christian pity; but what must we say of the conduct of such men as the Archbishop of Cologne, and his brother bishops and presbyters, who encourage and amass riches by the credulity of their spiritual slaves? They profess to be men of learning and enlarged information; they are the despotic guides of their abject followers;—do they then believe what they teach? It is nothing to say they do not inculcate secondary matters as articles of faith; though the dungeons of the Inquisition have abundantly proved that even this distinction is not admitted where the church of Rome is dominant; for Galileo found that practically the solar system is an article of faith; and a Papist at Cologne would be punished as severely for profaning a supposititious relic, as for blaspheming the name of God: if not by the secular power, yet by spiritual domination, and the denial of the sacraments, which is supposed to involve the unspeakable agonies of Purgatory, nay the condemnation of hell. We ask not then, under what nice distinctions, wholly unknown to the multitude, the belief in the authenticity of these relics and the worship of them are upheld. We ask only, does the pope, and do the archbishops, bishops, and clergy, believe what they inculcate? Are they honest or dishonest? Are they so credulously superstitious that their judgment and intellect are stunted, so that they are not qualified to guide themselves, much less others; or are they guilty of hypocrisy and unprincipled cupidity? Should some reader think that the day is gone by when it was necessary to discuss such subjects as we have been touching upon, we would ask, in reply, is the discussion of the subject superfluous, when a clergyman in a conspicuous station at Oxford, a prominent leader of an active party in our own church, a writer of "Tracts for the Times," and we have every reason to believe of that very tract No. 71 above quoted, prints a letter to his ignorant rustic parishioners, instructing them that finding some decayed bones in digging the foundations of their new church was a special token of the Divine approbation of their design; thus investing these relics of mortality, in popular opinion, with a character of sacredness; though very possibly they were the bones of executed murderers. Nay further, since the aforesaid Oxford tract teaches that the doctrine of Trent which enjoins that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke saints to honour and venerate their images, (and still more their personal relics,) is not beyond what the most cautious Christian may admit, though it stands to be sure rather on the verge of truth; it is but one step more to preserve the said Littlemore bones in a shrine or altar, and to go a pilgrimage to "honour and venerate" them. We lately read the following statement in the newspapers: "Introduction into France of the public worship of the new Saint Philomena, called the Thaumaturge of the nineteenth century, from the Miracles wrought by her relics and images, &c.—On Sunday last the inhabitants of the town of Montdidier, and many of those of the neighbouring communes, witnessed a procession in honour of the new saint.

All the parishes met, and the clergy, under the direction of the Lazarists, appeared in a body. Philomena is a saintess of very doubtful authenticity. In 1802, on turning over some ruins at Rome, what were supposed to be the ashes of a saint were discovered. Anon a name was found for her, and she now, in Italy, rivals the Virgin herself in the number and zeal of her worshippers."

We observe in another newspaper the following:

"Plenary Indulgences: Carmelite Church, White-friar street (Dublin). On Wednesday, the 8th instant, there will be seen the holy body of St. Valentinus, martyr, for forty successive days, in the Carmelite church, Whitefriars street, sent from Rome by his holiness, pope Gregory XVI. His Holiness, Pope Gregory XVI. has granted to all Christian faithful, of either sex, who, being truly penitent, and having confessed, and received the holy communion, shall visit the church of the Carmelites, White-friars street (which has been appointed by the Archbishop of Dublin for the exposition of the blessed body of St. Valentinus, martyr,) a plenary indulgence, commencing at first vespers, and continuing until sunset of said day, and with the privilege of applying those indulgences, by way of suffrage, to the faithful departed; and also an indulgence of forty days, if they shall, before his holy body (placed in said church), with contrite heart devoutly recite daily, three times, a Pater, Ave, and Glory be to the Father, in honour of St. Valentinus, and according to the intention of his Holiness.—The miracles wrought by St. Valentinus were numerous."

Since we copied the above we have read the following announcement, copied from the Malta official Gazette, issued under the censorship of her Britannic Majesty's government: "On Monday last, the most Reverend the Archbishop of Malta, with the chapter of his cathedral, performed a pontifical mass in the great church of St. John in Valetta, which was followed by a Te Deum Laudamus in music, when the attendance of the public was particularly numerous. His excellency the Governor, and the naval commander-in-chief, with their respective staffs, rear-admiral Sir T. Briggs, the members of the council of government, her Majesty's judges, and the Lords-Lieutenant were present." This is a practical commentary on the Oxford Tract doctrine, as announced by the Hon. and Rev. A. Percival, that there is nothing in the doctrines of popery that prevents our conscientiously communicating in the Church of Rome.

With such facts pressing upon us on every side, we cannot think that the subject on which we have been writing is out of date, and not worth notice. Everything is worth notice that shews the delusions of Popery, and puts Protestants on their guard against their subtle influence. We have more to add.

CHURCH SPOLIATION IN AMERICA.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THOSE who are "given to change" frequently remind us of the institutions of the United States as the very climax of civil and ecclesiastical relations. I have no wish to disparage them, and I bless God for the benefits which our trans-Atlantic fellow-men and fellow-Christians so largely enjoy; but I am far from thinking that many

things which look fair upon the surface, would endure the test of strict examination; and the institutions of the United States have not yet met with any severe shock to try their stability. In England we live in an old country, with an overgrown population pressing against the means of subsistence; and where, even if our laws and usages were perfection itself, there must of necessity be so much straitness and vicissitude, so many fluctuations in commerce and manufactures, so much penury in the midst of plenty, thousands of persons often not knowing where to procure bread to eat; that we cannot but expect frequent popular discontents, as though all these evils were political, or might be removed by legislative measures. On the contrary, America is a new country; there is a thin population and a vast extent of territory, so that no man needs be in want; and few or none are so, for the unexplored riches of the land are so great that they only ask the gathering; "plant a ten-penny nail," say the inhabitants, "and it sprouts up a crow-bar;" there is as yet no struggling of man with man for the necessaries of life; all can live well who choose to be industrious; and even the idle and dishonest are not much straitened for a bare maintenance; and no father of a family is at any loss to find bread for his children. Hence, there is as yet little room for popular discontent; for people not feeling those evils which multiply in an old country, have little temptation to quarrel with their public institutions. And yet, with this little, the United States are torn by intestine strifes, perhaps not to the extent, but after the manner, of England; and there is no reason to doubt that as years pass on difficulties will multiply around the American constitution, as they have done around all others.

But if the American Union is not as yet seriously embarrassed with popular discontents, it is with popular tyranny; if it has not an oligarchy of Whigs and Tories, it has a democracy of Lynch-law administrators; so that, though there is no fear of what is popular being outvoted, there is great fear of what is just not being popular, and therefore not supported. An unpopular right is always in serious danger of being denounced as a public wrong; and—to use an idiomatic phrase—of the weakest going to the wall.

I was led to the preceding remarks, from having lately perused Dr. Hawks's historical memoranda of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States; and particularly the account of the spoliation committed upon property rightfully belonging to it. In Virginia, for example, lands had been given to the Episcopal Church, or purchased long ago with money subscribed by its members, when there were few or no Dissenters in the colony; and the appropriation of these lands for church purposes was secured as a matter of right by legislative faith; yet when "the sovereign people" coveted them, they were snatched from their true owners, by that spirit of mob law which has too often put down right in all republics from Sparta or Athens, to the United States of America and revolutionary France. The protests of the convention of the Church, and the solemn opinion of the ablest jurists in Virginia, were alike disregarded; and on the 12th of January 1802, the legislature of Virginia passed a law, by virtue of which the glebes were ordered to be sold for the benefit of the public. The proceeds of the sale were directed to be appropriated to the poor of the parish, or to any other object which a majority of purchasers and housekeepers in the parish might by writing direct, provided that nothing should authorize an appropriation of it to any *religious* purpose

whatever. Under this act, not only glebes, but churches, and even the communion plate, have been sold. The purchasers of the glebes have paid almost nothing for them. After all that has been done, the public has not been benefited, either in a moral or a pecuniary way; and in some counties the money has gone into the hands of some of the overseers of the poor, and there remained. The sacred vessels of the temple have been scattered, and have passed in some instances into impious hands. Within our own times a reckless sensualist has administered the morning dram to his guests, from the silver cup which has often contained the consecrated symbol of the Saviour's blood. In another instance, the entire set of communion plate of one of the old churches, is in the hands of one who belongs to the Society of Baptists. It has fallen to the lot of the Bishop of Virginia, in the course of his visitations, to witness the conversion of a marble baptismal font into a watering trough for horses. "These facts," says Dr. Hawks—and let it be remarked it is an American, not an Englishman, who speaks—"did not indeed take place by virtue of the law of 1802; for that authorized no sale of the *furniture* of the church; but still they are the consequence of that law; they prove that when once the decree has gone forth, which touches what a church claims as its lawful rights—when once the public are taught that their legislators feel obliged, on such a subject, to yield to their demands, the barrier is broken down; might makes right, and no man can foretel how far the zeal of the people will outstrip the intentions of their legislators. The records of history present few or no instances in which spoliation of property devoted to literary or ecclesiastical purposes, has not failed, first, to accomplish the benefit which was avowed as the cause of the interference with it; and secondly, to be stayed within the limits contemplated by those who advised it."

Thus speaks Dr. Hawks—writing, not about Ireland, but Virginia; not with prepossessions which some might account narrow-minded, but in the great republic of America. I leave my readers to weigh these facts, and to apply them. I will not forestal their conclusions.

ANTI-LYNCH.

DESULTORY THOUGHTS ON RELIGIOUS POETRY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

DR. Johnson was assuredly an able and judicious critic: yet Dr. Johnson's theory—for theory I must call it—has been often refuted by the fact, that sacred poetry has frequently been made a vehicle of the most sublime conceptions, the most splendid imagery, and the most exquisite pathos. Dr. Johnson possessed a mind of high intellectual and moral power; which was, at once, a capacious and well furnished store-house of literary research, and an effective and ever working laboratory of acute observation and original thought. But perhaps Dr. Johnson wanted, at least in any high degree, a spiritual mind. Perhaps he wanted not the intimate knowledge of philosophic morals; but the instinctive sense of holiness; and, while he possessed a vivid perception of intellectual and moral beauty, failed in that spiritual tact which alone can apprehend and appreciate the beauty of holiness, and catch the congenial spirit, the illuminating light, that without creating or disturbing the materials kindles into new and peculiar beauty every-

thing which is of God. Had Dr. Johnson relished *less* the Attic nights of the Grecian or the Mitre, he would have relished *more* sacred poetry. He would have been better qualified to pronounce from the throne, to which general consent had raised him, a just judgment upon its comparative merits, in controversy with profane.

And why should sacred poetry, from its distinctive character, be less capable than profane of ministering pleasure to every rightly constituted mind? What elements of the moral or material universe are exempt from its sway: except, indeed, the false sentiment of impure or ungoverned passion; the wild rhapsodies of inordinate or unholy love? It is true that the whole genus of those affections are excluded from the sacred poet's touch which are "earthly, sensual, devilish;" and which are so faithfully but fearfully depicted in two lines of a modern profane poet, all whose rays, tinged as I admit they are with varied beauty, emanate from this one passion as their centre, and there again converge,

> "I know not, I ask not, if guilt's in that heart:
> I but know that I love thee, whatever thou art."

So speaks "a prophet of their own." Now this passion indeed is to the Christian poet forbidden ground: and this passion, and its natural offspring, revengeful and malignant hate, are, I grant, the sole yet sufficing materials from which, when revolved in the kaleidescope of a prurient imagination, many an admired poem, drama, and novel is constructed. But does Nature come forth in the morning with less majestic dignity, or smile with less fascinating loveliness, because contemplated by the chaste eye and wooed by the pure heart of a Christian? Or does the palace, to which, "in the silence of twilight's contemplative hour," or the hushed stillness of midnight, she retires, seem less magnificent and heart elevating, because to the spectator's ear and eye "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy work?" Are all the experiences of the heart, and the charities of life, less exquisite and less to be esteemed, because depurated from the base alloy of sensuality and selfishness; and because every pleasing scene of time opens upon eternity? Are any of the natural affections, parental, conjugal, filial, or fraternal, forbidden to the sacred poet's pen? Is the sanctuary of home, with all its hallowed memories and enjoyments, barred against him? No: the sacred poet may expatiate throughout created nature, as in a re-opened paradise, and cull every flower, to please the varied taste of the pure in heart. The weeds only with which sin has cursed the earth, and which, to the finer taste of every pure mind, would but mar the beauty and taint the sweetness of his poetic wreath, are forbidden to his touch.

But facts must decide the question, as to the capability of sacred subjects to energize the poet's mind with lofty conceptions or pathetic feelings: and a single Milton, or Cowper, or Watts, or Wesley, in their several departments—and in our own days, a single Pollok, Montgomery, or Hemans—were sufficient to evidence their capability. Any of these satisfactorily proves, that the general inferiority of sacred to profane poetry, is less the fault of the material than of the artist: and that if there are fewer Christian poets than profane, it is only because there are fewer Christian men than men of this world.

The distinguishing characters, as it appears to me, of religious poetry, should be piety, simplicity, and pathos: a combination which, congenial though the elements be, we often look for in vain. Of the

first of these characters, piety, there can be no question. It is the very essence of *religious* poetry: or more properly, the essential difference which distinguishes it from all other poetry, of whatever class or character. If simplicity be not equally necessary to its character as religious, it is indispensable to its excellence as poetry: and here, perhaps, one of the modern religious poets, to whom I have alluded, has grievously failed. He wants natural and unforced simplicity. There is to me—I believe to all—a peculiar and indescribable charm in the conviction which some volumes force upon us, that their author is not merely playing with *our* feelings, but developing his own. There is in some works that inexpressible air of life, which carries with it internal evidence that the volume enshrines the poet's heart: that its author is not a mere mechanical artificer of sentiments and feelings from the common-places of poetry, but that he is a genuine character, sympathizing with us in every emotion which his volume excites, and animating even the creations of fancy with the feelings of a genuine experience.

That a volume of religious poetry should furnish a wholesome as well as palatable entertainment, its pathos should be without any tendency to morbid feeling. It should, in fact, be *tender* yet *practical* piety. This is a very important consideration. It is one of the strongest recommendations of any volume, that it combines the tonic and demulcent. The grand object of moral regimen is, or ought to be, to preserve the feelings, those inlets of enjoyment, in all their tenderness and sensibility, and yet to nerve and shield them from the depressing influence of undue action within, or grating collision from abroad. There is a constant tendency in spirits of finer organization to depressed and morbid feeling. The very constitution of such a mind, the incessant friction of its delicate mechanism, worked by too powerful a spring, were alone sufficient to effect this; but more frequently it results from the unfitness of the sensitive and vulnerable heart, undisciplined and unsupported, to buffet with the rude shocks of a coarse, a selfish, and an unfeeling world. The truth is, such gentle and tender spirits can find no repose until they find it upon the bosom of God.

"Made for God, to God return,"

is the grand secret of their happiness; indeed of *all* happiness.

That every mind possesses its own peculiar and distinctive character I am as fully convinced, as that no one countenance is, in feature and expression, the exact copy of another, although our imperfect power of analysis can seldom accurately catch, and our poverty of expression seldom permits us accurately to depict, the shades of variety, whether in minds or faces. It may be deemed fanciful; but from constant observation, with this view, of works of sentiment and pathos—particularly when veiled in a poetic dress, where so much allowedly depends upon the feelings of the writer,—I am deeply convinced of this, that a peculiar and distinctive character is impressed upon the productions that emanate from minds of deep sensibility, which is not the result, merely of the thought, the language, or even the feelings that the words express; but which is the result of a more subtile transfusion of the essence and odour of the feeling in which the author wrote; a more direct and sensible contact of his spirit with that of the reader. I cannot otherwise account for the power with which, sometimes, the most simple language, and according to critical estimation disproportioned to the effect, sounds the very deepest chords of the heart. But

who can doubt this, who only reflects upon the subtle yet powerful spirit by which feeling is transfused into music, not only vocal but instrumental? and still more, who considers with how superior a force it is expressed, on the same instrument, and in the same music, by the touches of a performer who feels his subject, who enters fully into its spirit, and executes it *con amore*.

The cause—for of the fact I have no doubt—is perhaps this, that as generally the defect of accurate and forcible expression results, not so much from the poverty of language as from the want of a clear and strong conception, so he who writes under the present influence of deep and ardent emotion, will pour out his feelings in a torrent, unchecked by any languishings which demand a new stimulus, and therefore in language the best suited, not only to each particular feeling in its detail—this, cold and unfeeling tact could by diligence accomplish—but also to each in its context and connexion, as the component part of a grand whole, reflecting and receiving light. This gives a natural and unforced consecutiveness to the feelings, a unity to the emotion, however varied the parts of which it is composed—since that variety has been the result of a real experience—which stamps a marked and uniform character on the whole, and gives to each part in detail its just expression, its full and precise value. Hence every writer finds, that the most successful expression of his feelings has been that which was embodied in language with the greatest rapidity—that the most forceful and feeling emotions have been the most fluent. While, on the other hand, separate emotions, however strongly felt and forcibly expressed, but which have been separate experiences, not component parts of a single frame of mind, want that "smoothness in their distances," as the musician expresses it, which is requisite to the undisturbed flow of the reader's mind; in fact, to simplicity of impression. We travel with the author as through the beauties of a land of hills and vales. Each new eminence presents a new landscape, beautiful indeed as that we passed, but wholly disconnected from it. There is no *coup d'œil*, which blends, with nature's reality, the distinct features, and impresses at a glance the character of the whole.

(*To be continued.*)

ON BURNING THE SACRAMENTAL WINE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

A CORRESPONDENT, under the signature of Dominic, playfully blamed your ignorance, for not knowing what authority Mr. Newman could plead, for affixing a cross over the centre of the "altar," at his church at Littlemore, whereas the twentieth rubric of the mass-book expressly requires it: "Super altare collocetur crux in medio." Dominic's letter was well intended, and implied the substantial truth, that some of the late innovations at Oxford and elsewhere, are rather Popish than Protetsant in their complexion; but I doubt not yourself and your readers will concur with me, that irony was not the best vehicle for its conveyance. Grave remonstrance or reprehension, sorrow rather than raillery, should characterize every attempt to convince our neighbour of the error of his ways. In moral or religious questions,

arguments which partake of the *reductio ad absurdum*, even when convincing to others, do not conciliate the party whose benefit should be sought, and therefore bar up the entrance to the admission of truth. But with all seriousness I must say, that some of the doctrines and practices alluded to, remind me more of the missal and breviary, than of the Anglican prayer-book. When I read that Dr. Hook attested in the Archdeacon's Court that he poured out the Blood of Christ upon the consecrated pavement, and that he would have burned it if there had been a fire, I could not but call to mind some of the rubrics of the Church of Rome, to which there is nothing analogous in those of the Church of England. Your readers will doubtless recollect that the cloth called the "corporal," on which the Eucharist is laid, is considered so sacred, because, says the missal, a few drops of the blood of Christ may chance to have fallen upon it, that it must not be touched by lay hands, nor be washed; but when old or dirty, it is to be burned. May not Dr. Hook be reasonably supposed to have had in his mind the practice of the communion of Rome, which the divines of his school regard not as an apostacy, but a "dear sister?" The Church of England, in order to prevent superstitiously treasuring up the elements, as the Church of Rome does, under the notion that they are now Christ's body and blood, expressly says, in the rubrics after the communion: "If any of the bread and wine remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church; but the priest, and such other of the communicants as he shall call unto him, shall immediately after the blessing reverently eat and drink the same." Our church thus calls the elements that are left undisposed of, bread and wine: Dr. Hook calls them, Christ's body and blood. In like manner, in the catechism, our church says, that it is "bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received;" and that the body and blood of Christ are only "the thing signified;" and "the body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," are explained to be feeding "with our hearts by faith with thanksgiving;" whereas Dr. Hook makes both the faithful and unfaithful partake of Christ, by calling that his body and blood which may be materially poured out on a "consecrated pavement," or burned in the fire. Is not this the very essence of Popery?

CATHOLICUS.

RELIGIOUS MEMORIALS OF GENERAL WASHINGTON.

For the Christian Observer.

AN American clergyman, Mr. M'Guire, has for many years been engaged in collecting information relative to the religious character and opinions of General Washington, and has succeeded in forming a far more satisfactory exhibition of the subject than had before appeared. The facts are fully authenticated, and we feel much pleasure in transcribing a few of them.

"You will recollect that a most interesting incident, in relation to the life of the great American commander-in-chief, has been related as follows:—that while stationed at Valley Forge with the army, he was frequently observed to visit a secluded grove. This excited the curiosity of a Mr. Potts, of the denomination of *Friends*, who watched

his movements at one of these seasons of retirement, till he perceived that he was on his knees, and engaged in prayer. Mr. Potts then returned, and said to his family, 'Our cause is lost,'—(Mr. Potts was with the Tories)—[the English party were so called]—assigning his reasons for this opinion. There is a man, by the name of Devault Beaver, now living on this spot, eighty years of age, who says he had this statement from Mr. Potts and his family. I had before heard this interesting anecdote in the life of our venerated Washington, but had some misgivings about it, all of which are now most fully removed."

"It may be added, that besides the individual named by the above writer as having witnessed the private devotions of Gen. Washington at Valley Forge, it is known that Gen. Knox also was an accidental witness of the same, and was fully apprized that *prayer* was the object of the commander's frequent visits to the grove. This officer was especially devoted to the person of the Commander-in-chief, and had very free and familiar access to him; which may, in some measure, account for his particular knowledge of his habits.

"That an adjacent wood should have been selected as his private oratory, while regularly encamped for the winter, may excite inquiry. The cause may possibly be found in the fact that, in common with the officers and soldiers of the army, he lodged during that winter in a log hut, which, from the presence of Mrs. Washington, and perhaps other inmates, and the fewness of the apartments, did not admit of the privacy proper for such a duty.

"Another instance of this pious habit, witnessed during the war, has more recently been brought to light. In the year 1820, a clergyman, being in company with Major ——, a nephew of General Washington, had an accidental conversation with him on the subject of Christianity. The conversation was of a controversial nature in the beginning, and as no good seemed to ensue, but some warmth of feeling, an effort was made to arrest the unprofitable discussion by an inquiry made of the Major, as to the religious opinions of his distinguished kinsman, the subject of these pages. This was done in part, as knowing his veneration for Washington, and for information too, as he had been captain of the General's body guard, during a greater part of the war, and possessed the best opportunities of learning his views and habits. In answer to the question, he observed, after hesitating for a moment: 'General Washington was certainly a pious man, his opinions being in favour of religion, and his habits all of that character and description.' Being further interrogated as to his habits, he replied, that his uncle, he knew, was in the habit of praying in private. Then with the animation of an old soldier, excited by professional recollections rather than sympathy with the subject, he related the circumstances of the following occurrence. 'While encamped at ———, N. J., a soldier arrived one morning, about day-break, with despatches for the Commander-in-chief, from a distant division of the army. As soon as his business was known, he was directed to me as captain of the body guard, to whom he came forthwith, and giving me his papers, I repaired at once to the General's quarters. On my way to his room after reaching the house, I had to go along a narrow passage of some length. As I approached his door, it being yet nearly dark, I was arrested by the sound of a voice. I paused and listened for a moment, when I distinguished it as the General's voice, and in another moment found that he was engaged in audible prayer. As in his earnestness

he had not heard my footsteps—or, if he heard me, did not choose to be interrupted—I retired to the front of the dwelling, till such time as I supposed him unengaged; when returning, and no longer hearing his voice, I knocked at the door, which being promptly opened, I delivered the despatches, received an answer, and dismissed the soldier.'

"How impressive an example of sincere devotion have we here! The leader of our armies, though oppressed with cares and labours, an unequalled burden, yet forsakes his friendly couch at the dawn of day, and upon his knees, 'cries unto God with his voice.' He is not content with unuttered prayer. His earnestness seeks its natural vent in audible and articulate sounds."

"During his residence in Philadelphia, as President of the United States, it was the habit of Washington, winter and summer, to retire to his study at a certain hour every night. He usually did so at nine o'clock; always having a lighted candle in his hand, and closing the door carefully after him. A youthful member of his household, whose room was near the study, being just across the passage, observing this constant practice of the President, had his thoughts excited in reference to the cause of so uniform a custom. Accordingly, on one occasion, in the indulgence of a juvenile curiosity, he looked into the room sometime after the President had gone in; and found him upon his knees at a small table, with a candle and Bible thereon.

"In these facts we have evidence of his uniform attention to the divinely-commanded observance of private prayer. The evidence, too, embraces a very large portion of his life. Our limited and partial information comprehends a period of forty years—that is, from his twenty-third to beyond his sixtieth year. It was his habit while engaged in the French and Indian war; it was the same during the revolutionary war; and it was so also during his presidential terms; and no doubt it was so to the end of his life.

"It was in reference to this known excellence in Washington, that Dr. Mason, of New-York, in the funeral eulogy pronounced on the occasion of his death, in February, 1800, uses the language:—'That invisible Hand which guarded him at first, continued to guard and to guide him through the successive stages of the revolution. Nor did he account it a weakness to bend the knee in homage to its supremacy, and prayer for its direction. This was the armour of Washington, this the salvation of his country.'

The following facts illustrate his regard for the Sabbath:—

"In the town of ——, in Connecticut, where the roads are extremely rough, Washington was overtaken by night, on Saturday, not being able to reach the town where he designed to rest on the Sabbath. Next morning, about sun-rise, his coach was harnessed, and he was proceeding onward to an inn, near the place of worship which he proposed to attend. A plain man, who was an informing officer, came from a cottage, and inquired of the coachman whether there were any urgent reasons for his travelling on the Lord's-day. The General, instead of resenting this as impertinent rudeness, ordered the coachman to stop, and with great civility explained the circumstances to the officer, commending him for his fidelity, and assuring him that nothing was farther from his intention than to treat with disrespect the laws and usages of Connecticut, relative to the Sabbath, *which met with his most cordial approbation.*

"Though he had paid a marked respect to the claims of the Sabbath,

throughout his previous life—there seemed to be, during his Presidency, an increased regard and deference for it. Not only was he most punctual in his attendance on the public worship of God, whenever it was possible, but the discipline of his house was strictly conformed to the obligations and proprieties of the day. It was an established rule of his mansion, that visitors could not be admitted on Sundays. 'It is understood that an exception to the rule was made in the case of one individual, namely, Mr. Trumbull, Speaker of the House of Representatives. He often spent an hour on Sunday evenings with the President; and so entirely was the privilege confined to him, that it was usual with the house servant, when he heard the door-bell ring, on those evenings, to call it the 'speaker's bell.'

"After spending a part of the day at church, and occasionally an hour in the evening with Mr. Trumbull—one of the most pious men of his age—the rest of the time, preceding the hour of repose, was occupied by the President's reading to Mrs. Washington a sermon, or a portion of the Holy Scriptures."

The following are extracts from Washington's Diary, kept in the year 1760:

"Jan. 5th.—Mrs. Washington appeared to be something better. Mr. Green, however, came to see her about 11 o'clock, and in an hour Mrs. Fairfax arrived. Mr. Green prescribed, and just as we were going to dinner, Captain Walter Stuart appeared, with Dr. Laurie; the evening being very cold, and the wind high, Mrs. Fairfax went home in the chariot.

"6th.—the chariot not returning time enough from Colonel Fairfax's *we were prevented from going to church.* Mrs. Washington is a good deal better to-day."

"It would appear, then, that even Mrs. Washington's indisposition and confinement at home, would not have been regarded as a sufficient excuse for neglecting the public worship of God, had not the unexpected delay of the chariot interfered with the performance of that duty."

"In the year 1774, Washington went to Williamsburg, as a member of the house of burgesses. The horizon of our country was then becoming dark with clouds, portending the approach of war. In the month of May, a short time after the members had assembled, information was received of an act of parliament for shutting up the port of Boston—to take effect on the 1st of June. The members being much excited by this hostile proceeding on the part of the British government, when they met on the 24th of May, passed an order that the 1st day of June 'should be set apart by that house as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, devoutly to implore the Divine interposition for averting the heavy calamity which threatened destruction to their civil rights, and the evils of civil war, and to give them one heart and one mind, firmly to oppose, by all just and proper means, every injury to American rights.' June the 1st, being the day appointed as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, the following brief entry is found in a diary kept by Washington at that time:—'June 1st, Wednesday.—Went to church and fasted all day.' He went to church, in conformity with the order passed by the house of burgesses. But not only so—he did that also which perhaps was not known to any mortal; which was known only to God,—*he fasted all day.*"

ART OF TEACHING—USE OF WORDS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

PERMIT me to add to Lucidus Ordo's remarks on the art of oral teaching, the great importance of using words in the sense in which the majority of the hearers are likely to understand them. Books may be re-considered, and the "hard words" looked out in a dictionary; but the spoken word is gone for ever. A medical student was lately admonished in a court of justice, for saying that a man had "a *comminuted fracture* of the jaw," since many jurymen, it was observed, might not understand that technical description of the injury. The phrase was proper enough in the medical theatre, but not there. A good woman, in giving her neighbour an account of an anti-slavery speech, said that some planters had actually *manimitted* (manumitted) the poor slaves. What manumission was, neither she nor her neighbour knew; but both agreed that it must be some very dreadful torture. The anti-slavery advocate had therefore spoken unintelligibly, so far as these worthy women were concerned. Still worse was the classical affectation of Lord Stanley's Abolition Bill, about apprentices, "predial," "non-predial," "predial attached," and "predial non-attached." Why not have said, in plain English, field apprentices, and house apprentices, or whatever was meant; for I do not pretend to understand the jargon, nor was I much enlightened by being told that they were terms connected with the ancient "adscripts of the glebe," which is Latin, not English.

A man who has the cure of souls ought not to trifle with so awful a trust, by shewing his own learning instead of instructing his flock. It was a good retort of the blunt old deacon at the meeting-house, when his minister said to a very illiterate congregation, "I am *solicitous* that you should bring your Bibles with you, and *collate* the *references*"—"And our *dixonaries* too, Sir." On looking back a few lines I see that I have myself used a technical phrase, proper enough in a paper for the Christian Observer, but which in a sermon might be misunderstood by a large majority of the congregation. "The *cure* of souls." What uneducated person uses that word in its sense of *taking care of*, and not necessarily of healing? The popular jest of the "veterinary" surgeon (another modern affectation, meaning, I suppose, a horse or cattle doctor) who wrote in his bill, "for curing your honour's horse till he died," shews that, in vernacular phrase, *cure* does not mean attending upon, but successful attendance; but alas! a *curator* is not always a *curer*. I have sometimes thought, that the secondary use of the word *cure* originated in the days of popery, when the people hearing the priest spoken of classically, as one who had the *cure* of souls, and considering his absolution as their healing, substituted the one for the other. Words frequently thus acquire a secondary meaning. To tempt is only to persuade; but as the persuasion often causes a desire to comply, the latter comes to be blended with the former; and the idea of probation is mixed up with that of yielding. If a man had offered Aristides a purse of gold to give an unjust decision, and Aristides had spurned the offer, it would be classically correct to say that he was tempted to injustice by a large bribe; but popularly it would be incorrect, and would lead to a misrepresen-

tation. The Sunday school-girl, when she says that she was tempted to buy a new ribbon, or to wear an artificial flower in her bonnet, does not mean that some person persuaded her, but that her own vain heart drew that way. There is also another secondary idea involved in the word tempt; for, as we are oftener allured to do what is evil than what is good, the word is usually taken in a bad sense, though it equally admits of a good one; it is simply a trial of our constancy, whether in resisting what is pleasingly evil, or doing what is painfully good. God tempts no man to evil, and yet God tempted Abraham—he tried his faith. The translators of our Bible, Exod. xvii. 7, read, "and he called the name of that place Massah"—margin, "tentation." This is the French word from which our corresponding English word is taken; and yet we feel a difference, as if the French to an English ear had not so much of the secondary sense, but adhered to the notion of trying or proving. Every religious instructor preserves these distinctions while endeavouring to make ignorant persons understand what is meant by our Lord's being tempted, in the sense of tried, and yet not in the sense of feeling any inclination to yield to the temptation.

I might say much more; but the foregoing will suffice to shew the necessity of using words in the sense in which they are intelligible to the hearer.

CHIARO-OBSCURO.

ON THE ALLEGED AUTHORITY OF THE FIRST FOUR GENERAL COUNCILS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of the Christain Observer.

After carefully reading your remarks upon the alleged authority of the First Four General Councils, I am well satisfied that you have taken a sound view of the case. I understand you to argue, First, that the clause in the statute of the first of Elizabeth, which mentions those councils, was not a declaration of doctrine, but merely a restriction upon the power of the High Commission Court, in deciding upon questions of heresy; and that even this indirect reference, so far from being "unreserved" in virtue of any inherent authority in those councils, was simply on the ground that their decisions were justified "by the express words of Scripture," which is quite agreeable to the twenty-first Anglican article, published a few years after, which declares that General Councils "may err" and "have erred," and that "things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." Secondly; that the clause was cancelled by a subsequent statute in 1640, which repealed the provisions of Elizabeth touching the High Commission Court; as is admitted by Dr. Burn, Bishop Gibson, and other canonists. Thirdly, that even while the High Commission Court existed, the clause was virtually, if not expressly, repealed by the Act of 13 Elizabeth, which set forth the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, as containing the doctrine of the Church of England: from which period, subsequent statutes refer to those articles, and never make any allusion to the decisions of the First Four Councils, scriptural though they were, and of great value as historical testimony.

But there is a fourth consideration which you appear to have overlooked; but which ought to have especial weight with those who profess peculiar zeal for church authority, namely, that the statute of 1 Elizabeth I. is a mere act of Parliament;—a secular act, not an act of the church, and had no sanction, that I ever heard, of convocation. Admit, for the sake of argument, that the statute recognized unreservedly the first Four General Councils, still this was the recognition, not of the church, but of a lay legislature; comprising indeed bishops, but not the inferior clergy; and those bishops a minority in the house in which they sat. But, on the contrary, the act of the 13th of Elizabeth (cap. 12,) is an act recognizing and sanctioning the Thirty-nine Articles, which had been previously agreed upon in convocation; and here, we may be truly said to have the judgment of the Anglican church; first, of the clergy assembled in convocation; and then of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, the acts of each body being sanctioned and confirmed by the sovereign;—the *first* judgment of our Protestant church, after it had emerged from the Popery re-established by Queen Mary, and its *last* judgment also, from which it has never swerved *as a church*, however far individual members may have departed from its standard.

I heartily wish success to your New Series, and am, &c. &c.

*** We are much indebted to the learned friend who has reminded us of this fourth consideration. We did not, however, overlook it; for we expressly mentioned (see Appendix for 1837, p. 832) that we "did not touch upon the question whether this being merely an Act of Parliament" was an "authoritative decision of the Church of England." Our reason for not going into this discussion was, that any one of the other three arguments is of itself quite sufficient; and we did not wish to encumber ourselves with a consideration which would require an examination of several historical facts, and also an inquiry into the large question of the separate provinces of civil and ecclesiastical legislation. We must, however, express our surprise at the inconsistency and Erastianism of the school to which Mr. Russel belongs, in making a clause of an Act of Parliament the standard of the decisions of the Church of England.

ON THE REV. J. NEWMAN'S LECTURES ON ROMANISM:—TRADITION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE already sent you some remarks on the "advertisement" to the Rev. J. Newman's Lectures; and I feel inclined to add a few observations on the Lectures themselves. The author builds on a false notion of the Church,—and a very false view of tradition. Let these two insecure supports be taken away, and his imposing structure will inevitably fall to the ground; for there is nothing but these two props to support it. But I shall confine my remarks chiefly to tradition, as that is the *main* prop on which he builds his system.

His view on this subject differs but little from that of the Romanists. He maintains that there is a stream of tradition in the same sense as the Church of Rome; only he cuts it off at some indeterminate period, somewhere between the fourth and seventh century. His

reasons for the existence of such a stream as he maintains, will not satisfy any true Protestant; nor will his reasons for cutting short its progress satisfy any Romanist. His opinion is, that there were some truths—and those important ones, without which we cannot well know the genuine faith—left unrecorded, but which were delivered by the Apostles to their successors, and have been transmitted to future generations; and that they are now to be found in the writings of the Fathers, and in the decrees of councils, as far down, with respect to time, as what cannot be now exactly specified. In the things thus delivered down to posterity, he includes, so far as I can make out, usage, doctrine, and interpretation of Scripture. This appears to me to be his view of tradition.

For such an opinion, he gives us, as I think, no solid reasons, but only some such surmises and conjectures as the Romanists are in the habit of giving. He takes for granted, as they do, that the traditions mentioned by St. Paul were such as were transmitted orally, and afterwards recorded by the Fathers; contrary to the statements of some of those fathers themselves, who, as he maintains, did transmit them; and quite contrary to the current use of the word tradition in that age, and in the ages immediately succeeding.

"When St. Peter," says Bishop Burnet on the sixth article, "knew by a special revelation that he was near his end, he writ his second epistle, that they might have that as a means of keeping 'those things always in remembrance after his death.' Nor do the Apostles give us *any hints* of their having left anything with the Church, to be conveyed down by oral tradition, which they themselves had not put in writing: they do sometimes refer themselves to such things as they had delivered to particular churches; but *by tradition in the Apostles' days, and for some ages after, it is very clear, that they meant only the conveyance of the faith, and not any unwritten doctrines.*" The sensible, reasonable, and scriptural view of this subject given by the bishop on the sixth article, forms a striking contrast to the opinions of Mr. Newman; who seems to be minutely acquainted with all that the Romanists have asserted respecting the incompleteness, obscurity, and mysteriousness of Scripture; and hence of the necessity of something additional. No Romanist has ever alleged more for the purpose of depreciating Scripture, and of exalting tradition. Let me call attention to the following extracts:—

"We consider the Church as a witness, a keeper and witness of Catholic tradition." This notion degrades the Church; making her the keeper of what cannot now, with any certainty, be known, and therefore worth very little or nothing. How much more dignified does our Article XX. make her, by setting her forth as "the witness and keeper of Holy Writ." But the author may say, she is the witness and keeper of both. He may say so, but our Church does not say so in any of her Articles, or other documents. He goes on,—"She bears witness to a fact, that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received and *came from the Apostles.*" p. 321.—"We consider antiquity and catholicity to be the *real guides*, and the Church their organ." p. 322.—"The present Church, then, in our view of her office, is not so much the judge of Scripture, as a witness of catholic truths delivered to her in the first ages, whether by councils or by fathers, or in whatever other way," p. 323.

The way in which Mr. Newman attempts to prove tradition to be

of this high character—"the authoritative teacher," as he says in one place, "of Christians"—is exactly the same with that adopted by the Romanists. The only argument which seems to have any semblance of truth, is that derived from the fact of the New Testament itself being received on the testimony of the Primitive Church. The various ways in which he states this fact, shew a want of discrimination: for I would not impute a want of honesty. Thus, he says that we use tradition "for the establishment of the *divinity* of the Scripture," and that we "receive through tradition both the Bible itself, and *the doctrine that it is divinely inspired.*" But it is *not* true, that we build the *divinity* of Scripture on the testimony of the Fathers, or that we receive from them the doctrine that it is divinely inspired. This is wholly a false and distorted statement. Their testimony—that is, written testimony, not oral tradition—is of weight only as it regards certain writings being handed down as the writings of the Apostles and their companions. Their divinity we infer from that fact. We do not receive them because the fathers say that they are Divine, but because they tell us that they are the writings of the Apostles and their associates. This is the view of Bishop Burnet, as given in his Exposition of the Sixth Article. "A great difference," he says, "is to be made between all this and the oral tradition of a doctrine, in which there is nothing fixed or permanent, so that the whole is only report, carried about and handed down. Whereas here is a book, that was only to be copied and read publicly, and by all persons; between which the difference is so vast, that it is as little possible to imagine how the one (tradition) should continue pure, as how the other (Scripture) should come to be corrupted."—"The authority of these books," adds the bishop, "is not derived from any judgment that the Church made concerning them; but from this, that it was known that they were writ, either by men who were themselves the Apostles of Christ, or by those who were their assistants and companions."

If our author's argument will hold good as to Christian traditions, it may hold good as to Jewish traditions. If it be said, Since you receive the New Testament through the testimony of the Primitive Church, you ought also to receive its traditions: it may be equally said, since you receive the Old Testament through the testimony of the Jewish church, you ought also to receive the Jewish traditions. The Jews, in our Saviour's time, and in succeeding ages, might use exactly the same argument with Mr. Newman. Of this he was evidently aware, and therefore he brings in his "catholicity:" but it does not serve his purpose; for there is catholicity *as much* in the one case as the other. It must appear, truly, very strange to any unbiassed mind, that the Christian Church should fall into the same error, as to oral traditions, as the Jewish, especially when it is considered how decidedly and strongly our Saviour condemned traditions, and how He and his Apostles invariably appealed to the written word. It might have been thought that this example would have afforded sufficient warning to all preceding ages: but it has not. Man is the same being, essentially, in every age; fond of shadows, and disliking realities; enamoured with what flatters his pride, pleases his fancy, and serves his interest; and turning away from what opposes the selfish and corrupt principles of his nature.

In one of the extracts which have been made, our author speaks of tradition as "coming from the Apostles." Now if this can be *proved,*

it is, of course, entitled to the same attention with Scripture: but he is not "venturesome" enough yet to say so, though, if he continue to indulge himself in such statements as the following, he may, in time, get courage to make such an assertion:—He says, "Whatever might formerly have been possessed of a strictly traditionary nature; whatever of rich, but unsorted and uncatalogued treasures; whatever *too sacred* or *too subtle to record in words*, whether comments on Scripture, or principles of interpreting them, or Apostolic usages; still we have the essentials of faith," p. 249. Mr. Newman seems to lament this loss! And yet he has only to go to the Church of Rome, and he will find all that he has lost, "sorted and catalogued" in decrees of councils and in the bulls of the infallible popes: and whatever has been "too sacred and too subtle to be recorded in words," he may find in the *oral* traditions of that church! He is, however, very inconsistent: he is either wrong in what he asserts, or he wrongs tradition. If he is right in saying that it comes from the Apostles, then he ought to join the Romanists and say that it is of equal authority with Scripture. But that any man, freed from the fetters of interest and prejudice, knowing what human nature is, and how merely oral reports soon grow into fables, and acquainted in any degree with the history of the Primitive Church, should give to tradition the same weight of authority as to Scripture, is really so monstrous as to exceed the bounds of credibility. The Church of England, in her Twenty-fifth Article, says, that the five Popish Sacraments, "which are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel," "have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles." But what surprises me exeeedingly, is the attempt made by our author to fix tradition on the Church of England, which acknowledges its authority, as to doctrine, in none of her documents. "Our Church," he says, "adheres to a double rule, Scripture and Catholic tradition; and considers that in all matters necessary to salvation, both safeguards are vouchsafed to us." (p. 326.) He seems aware of the difficulty of proving this point; and hence in pages 338 and 339 we have some strange philosophisings on the subject, for the purpose of accounting for the omission of more direct reference to tradition. However, he attempts in other parts to make the Church of England recognize the authority of tradition. He refers to the first Homily as implying the principle which he advocates; but I can find nothing there but "the stinking puddles of men's traditions," an expression which surely implies nothing favourable to his scheme. There is an old canon made in 1571, which seems, at first sight, to afford him some help: but even that yields him no real assistance; for it mentions only what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops *collected* from the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and not what they transmitted down by oral tradition from the Apostles. And what they *collected* seems evidently to refer, from the other parts of the canon, not to any doctrinal subjects, or to the articles, but to matters of discipline, especially to the Form of Ordination of archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons: for the articles are afterwards expressly said to "have been, without doubt, collected from the sacred books of the Old and New Testament,"* and not from tradition, as conveying the Catholic

* The canon itself is too long to be quoted, but the following are the words respecting the Articles:—Articuli illi religionis christianæ, in quos consensum

faith.—There is one more attempt made to link tradition to our Church. The adoption of the creeds, it is said, proves this point: and "the Catholic faith" is mentioned in one of them. Could there be anything so flimsy as this, especially when the article states expressly on what ground they are received and adopted. They ought "to be thoroughly received and believed," says the article, "*for* they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." They are adopted, *not* on the ground of tradition, but on the ground of their scriptural character.*

(*To be continued.*)

---

est ab Episcopis in legitima et sancta Synodo, jussu atque authoritate serenissimæ Principis Elizabethæ convocata et celebrata, *haud dubie collecti sunt ex sacris libris veteris et novi Testamenti.*—A collection of Articles, &c., third edition, printed in 1675, made, as supposed, by Bishop Sparrow; p. 238.

A portion of the concluding part of this canon I beg leave to recommend to the attention of the authors of the Oxford Tracts. It is as follows:—*Vanas et aniles opiniones, et hæreses, et errores pontificios*, a doctrina et fide Christi abhorrentes, *non docebunt*. Let them observe this part of the canon, and we shall have no more such Oxford Tracts as we have had.—It is not necessary to translate the foregoing sentence, for the sake of the authors themselves; but for the sake of some readers, I will do so:—"They shall not teach vain and womanish [*anile*] opinions and heresies, and pontifical [*priestly*] errors, abhorrent to the doctrine and faith of Christ." It is not said, abhorrent to the Catholic faith or Catholic tradition, as our author would doubtless have added, if he had drawn it up.

* These three creeds, especially the Apostles', are made an unwarranted use of by our author. Valuable as they are, as doctrinal expositions, none of them are entitled to any high regard on the ground of antiquity. The creed of *Athanasius* is not thought to have been drawn up by him; but to have been collected by some one, nobody knows by whom, from his writings. It is not, says Bishop Burnet, among his works; nor was it ever heard of *before the eighth* century, an age not very remarkable for purity of doctrine.—The *Nicean* creed is the creed of a council held at Nice in the *fourth* century, but not exactly as we have it now: the procession of the Holy Ghost "from the Father," was added in the second general council at Constantinople, and, "from the Son," was added by the Western Church.—The Apostles' creed is not thought, by any person versed in antiquity, to have been drawn up by them. "There is no reason," says Bishop Burnet, "to believe that this creed was prepared by the Apostles, or that it was of *any great antiquity*, since *Ruffin* (who lived in the 4th century) was *the first that published it*. It is true he published it as the creed of the Church of Aquileia: but that was so late, that neither this nor the other creeds have *any authority on their own account.*"—How wisely, therefore, has our Church acted in adopting these symbols, not on the ground of antiquity or tradition, but on the ground of their being capable of proof from Holy Scripture. They were no doubt viewed by our reformers as containing brief and convenient summaries of Divine truths, exactly in the same way as if any Protestant Church were to adopt Dr. Watts' Catechism, without an atom of idea of bearing testimony, as our author would have it, to tradition.

Durandus, as quoted by Bishop Stillingfleet, in his "Council of Trent Examined," &c. has these words:—"*All* truth is contained in the Holy Scripture at large; but *for the peoples' conveniency*, the necessary points are summed up in the Apostles' creed."

This learned Romanist had a far better idea of the ground on which this creed is adopted, than our author. Many Romanists before the Council of Trent, as Bishop Stillingfleet clearly proves, denied explicitly what our author maintains, that is, the authority of tradition; and held expressly, that the Scripture alone is the test of truth and the rule of faith. The following is the testimony of John *Garson*, declared by *Zabarella*, in the Council of *Constance*, to be the greatest divine of his time:—"Scriptura nobis tradita est, tanquam regula *sufficiens* et *infallibilis*, pro regimine ecclesiastici corporis et membrorum, usque in finem seculi." The Scripture has been delivered to us as a *sufficient* and *infallible rule* for the government of the ecclesiastical body and members, to the end of the world.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

For the Christian Observer.

HOPE IN DEATH.

WHERE, oh where shall I die? 'Mid the friends I love best?
From the bosom of home shall I fly to my rest?
Shall fond brethren and sisters keep watch on mine eye,
By its glances divining each want to supply?
Shall the arms of fond parents around me be spread,
And their love smooth my pillow, and soften my bed?
Shall affection thus brighten my path to the sky?
In my chamber of peace, is it there I shall die?

Where, oh where shall I die? Far away on the billow?
Shall the bosom of ocean heave under my pillow?
Shall no parent, no brother, no sister be near?
On their loved one's pale brow to let fall the sad tear?
Not a mourner around, save the wind and the wave—
Nought of prospect to cheer me, but ocean my grave?
Shall a stranger's cold glances reprove my last sigh?
Far off on the wave, is it there I must die?

Where, oh where shall I die? In some far distant clime?
Is it thence I shall 'scape from the sorrows of time?
Still more severed from parents, and country, and home,
Than when rocked by the billow, and tossed by the foam.
'Mid the blaze of the tropics, or frosts of the pole,
With none nigh me whose solace might gladden my soul;
Unfriended, a stranger, alone shall I lie?
In a far distant land, is it there I must die?

Where, oh where shall I die? but thou, Lord, knowest best:
Or from home let it be that I 'scape to my rest;
Or emerging from ocean's rough billows arise
To still waters above, to my port in the skies;
Or from far distant climes, reft and weary, I soar
To a land where earth's toils and its sorrows are o'er—
Whence, it recks not, nor when, I to paradise fly,
If living to Jesus, in Jesus I die!

H. L. W.

IDLE AND PROFITABLE READING.

THERE'S wisdom in this volume:—*let me trace*
The page for deep instruction. *Woe is me!*
My wilful heart for wisdom hath no place;
Some glowing thought, some word of melody,
Some gem of lustrous radiance, *meets my eyes:*
And then fond fancy haunts me; *and I stray*
In magic worlds;—*but I will strive and pray*
That the new wakened thought may upward rise,
And make celestial song though poor and weak:
Up! upward still my strain be thou ascending,
And not with things of this low earth be blending.
The good, the wise, the holy may I seek;
And aye in hallowed song—O my weak heart—
Cease not to pray and strive to bear thy part.

E. L. A.

A PERFECT WORLD.

FIND me a babe that ne'er hath shed a tear;
Find me a child that ne'er hath known a fear:
Find me a man who never thought a sin;
Find me a cot where care ne'er entered in;

Find me a strifeless town—a fraudless mart—
A church unsullied, or a stainless heart;
Find me a world where want, and plague, and war,
Waft not their shafts, or angry passions jar:—
And I will find a hallowed world of bliss;
And such a world there is—*but 'tis not this.* S. C. W.

THE FRAIL BARK.

Oh rash and senseless Mariner
Who brav'st the stormy sea;
And say'st unto thy shattered bark,
My bark I trust to thee.

I know full well the dangerous deep,
The perils of the flood;
But still thou art my trusty bark,
And firm thou art and good.

Fair vessel I will cleave to thee,
Though winds and billows roar,
Nor doubt that thou hast strength enough
To bear me to the shore.

They tell me of a refuge port,
From the wild billows' swell:
Yet still, my bark, I cling to thee—
I feel thou dost right well.

But when his sails are tempest torn,
Nor stands his skiff the shock—
Ah then the fainting mariner
Seeks port, and dreads the rock.

And thus it is with man's frail works;
We proudly on them stay,
And see Thee not, O gracious Lord,
The life, the truth, the way.

But when away the hailstorm sweeps
Earth's refuges of lies;
For shelter then alone to Thee
The wretched sinner flies. E. L. A.

FAITH UNDER ADVERSITY.

Mark where, upstarting from the breast
Of his pure ocean-couch serene,
The orb of day, with golden sheen,
Lights up the portals of the East;—
The clouds that late all cheerless lay,
In folds of darkness round the sky,
Touched by a pure, celestial ray
Of light, just fresh from morning's eye,
Break forth in smiles, or, floating by
At the first blush of infant day,
Like softening snow-wreaths melt away:
And the distant heights of the vaults above
(As hearts when swept by breath of love),
Fast gath'ring up those streaks of light,
Dropt by the sun-beams, in their flight
To the far realms they left at even,
Awake the revelries of heaven.

'Tis thus, when cradled round him, lie
The tempests of adversity,
Breaks o'er this wilderness of tears,
To chase away the Christian's fears,
The light of faith,—it sooths, it cheers,

The wounded mind—the quivering soul—
It wrings its anguish from the smart,
That fain would fester in the heart,
And makes affliction merciful.
And then, as if to gild the road—
That path retired which leads to God—
To lure the wanderer to the sky,
In radiance bright it beams from high,
Controls his steps, and points from earth
To heav'n, from whence it hath its birth. I. E. P.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FABER ON THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

The Primitive Doctrine of Justification, investigated: relatively to the several Definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England; and with a special reference to the Opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as Published in his Remains. By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury.

THIS important and seasonable book must not be passed over lightly. It will require more time and space than we can afford in the present number to do justice to it; but we will extract sufficient to show its value as bearing upon some much controverted topics. Mr. Faber is at this time engaged upon a very laborious critical investigation of the early history of the Waldenses, respecting which there has been of late much minute controversy; but he has turned aside to interject a volume upon the momentous doctrine of justification by faith. We did indeed hope that this fundamental scriptural and Protestant doctrine was beginning to be very generally understood and acknowledged among all persons professing to be theologians in the Church of England; and we bless God, in commencing a new series of our labours, that much of the ignorance and prejudice which prevailed on the subject thirty or forty years ago has been removed; that the doctrine is faithfully proclaimed in numberless books, tracts, and pulpits: and that very few persons are found who venture verbally to contradict it; indeed the scriptures, and our own Protestant formularies grounded on them, are so plain, and have been so largely dwelt upon by the defenders of the doctrine during the last quarter of a century, that no well-read divine ventures to say in direct terms, as was very commonly said a few years ago, that we are justified either by works, or by works and faith conjointly. But what avails scriptural correctness of phrase, if the meaning be not scriptural too? It was comparatively easy to make the most uneducated reader perceive that those who spoke of man's works, as in whole or part the ground of his justification, contradicted the Bible, the Prayer book, the Articles, and the Homilies; but ignorant persons are misled when they hear the scriptural phrase used, without explanation; and as they suppose in its correct Protestant acceptation; whereas, in reality, it is employed in a sense which many a Romanist will admit, as much as Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, or Mr. Newman; namely, as implying what Bishop Burnet

calls "the most mischievous of all those practical errors that are in the church of Rome, the doctrine of sacramental justification." Mr. Newman said, in his first letter to us last year (p. 125,) "perhaps there has been that in the religious aspect of the hour which has flattered many who agree with you, and perhaps yourself, that the day of mere struggle was past, and that of triumph was come; that your principles were professed by all the serious, all the active, men in the church, the old defenders of opposite views dying off; and that now, by the force of character, or by influence in high places, they would be secured a permanent impression upon our religious system. And if so, you are not unnaturally surprised to find *uno avulso, non deficit alter;* to find a sudden obstacle in your path, and that from a quarter whence you looked not for it." We confess that we were—we will not say surprised—but certainly much grieved, to see this new obstacle to scriptural truth. We did hope that "the serious men in the church" rejoiced to acknowledge the true doctrine of justification by faith; and this not in the Romanist sense of sacramental justification; but in that obvious protestant sense in which Luther spoke of it as the "*Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ,*" and in which sense the Anglican and all the other reformed confessions uphold it. And this hope was not visionary; for till recently the protestant meaning was the meaning admitted both by those who embraced, and by those who rejected, the doctrine; and the number of the former has, without any manner of doubt, very greatly increased. A third solution, a solution which admits the words of St. Paul, and of the formularies of the Church of England to the ear, but relegates them to the Romanist signification, was scarcely thought of; for those who did not plainly preach justification through faith, preached it through works; never suspecting that there was a method of combining their anti-evangelical opinions with evangelical language, by contending, that all infants are justified in baptism by the vicarious faith of others; that there is no other way of justification but in baptism; and that baptism being general, the great mass of persons throughout christendom are already justified; so that the whole doctrine which Luther and our own reformers made such account of, the Oxford tracts teach, is after all a mere speculative nicety, and not a matter of any practical moment. However, if the battles of the Reformation are to be fought over again, not with avowed Romanists, but with professed Anglicans, who account popery their "dear sister," and consider protestantism as a rationalistic neologian schism, the friends of the pure gospel of Christ, unsophisticated by human devices, have only to take up the spiritual arms of their godly forefathers, and with the Bible in their hands to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. For ourselves, while we deeply lament that there should be cause for re-arguing questions which were settled three hundred years ago, wherever the confessions of the protestant and reformed churches were adopted, we have no wish to shrink from our humble share of the important duty; and we rejoice that the very first number of our new series will not be without a few smooth stones gathered from the living waters of Divine truth, to hurl at that giant error, which our reformers justly accounted the Goliath of popery.

The prominent object of Mr. Faber's volume is not so much to shew what is the doctrine of

Scripture, or of our own church, or of the other reformed churches; (though all these are incidentally and very ably handled) as to answer the objection that the protestant doctrine is a novelty unknown to Christ's Holy Catholic Church, from the days of the Apostles to those of Luther. Now though tradition is not authority, yet the testimony of wise and holy men of the early ages of the Gospel is not to be overlooked in the interpretation of sacred writ. Its exact place, and force, and limits it were beside the immediate purpose of the present remarks to discuss; and other opportunities will occur for taking up this topic; but were the testimony of antiquity either as weighty as the Papists consider it, or as worthless as some ultra-protestants have considered it; it will in any case be well to ascertain what that testimony is, were it only because it has been perverted, and the perversion has perplexed some sincere inquirers after truth. Hence our reformers themselves, while they uphold the Bible, and the Bible only, as the code of the religion of protestants, to the exclusion of all human authority, yet considered it not superfluous to shew the Romanist, who vainly boasted of tradition, that the genuine traditions of Christ's Holy Catholic Church are against the innovations of the papal apostacy; and also to dissipate the anxieties of many sincere protestants, who were alarmed at being told that their religion was a novelty. Indeed, under the peculiar circumstances of the protestant churches just emerging from popery, we are not to wonder if this argument was sometimes rendered too prominent; as if the contest was rather who had the ancient authors on their side, than who had the Bible; whereas the meaning of the reformers was that protestants have both.

This appeal to the Fathers has of late been revived within the bosom of our own Church, in favour of some of those Romanist views which our Reformers contended were supported neither by primitive antiquity nor by Scripture. The Papists appealed to the Fathers against what Protestants affirm to be the Scriptural doctrine of justification; and they were sufficiently answered; though perhaps not with such copious adduction of evidence as on some other points; and this possibly because historical testimony was considered more important in relation to such delusions as that of transubstantiation, which had grown up insidiously, and against which the Apostles had no need to warn the first converts to Christianity because they did not exist in their day; than in relation to the question of Justification which had been largely discussed in the sacred writings, serious errors respecting it having been rife, even in the infant church.

It is so important that it should be clearly understood what are the exact points in discussion upon the doctrine of justification, that we will exhibit Mr. Faber's very lucid survey of what he justly calls the "two diametrically opposed systems" under consideration. He does not soften down the difference, as some are ready to do, with qualifying phrases, such as, "The Oxford Tracts perhaps go too far, and so do ultra-Protestants;" "The homilies may be a little too strong on one side, and the Articles of Trent on the other;" "Our divines express themselves differently, but practically they doubtless mean much the same thing;"—no, he says most justly that the systems are "diametrically opposed," and so taught St. Paul before him.

"The one system grounds our justification upon our own intrinsic righteousness, infused into us by God, through

our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The other system grounds our justification upon the extrinsic righteousness of Christ, appropriated and forensically made our own by faith as by an appointed instrument.

"The one teaches: that we are not merely reputed, but actually made, righteous, to an amount sufficient, through this precise medium, to procure and effect our justification before God. The other teaches: that we are justified only on account of the perfect righteousness of Christ; through the medium of faith which we have imputed to us (as the Apostle speaks) instead of righteousness which we have not.

"The one identifies the righteousness of sanctification which is inherent but not perfect, with the righteousness of justification which is perfect but not inherent. The other carefully distinguishes, both in office and in character and in order of succession, the perfect righteousness of justification which is Christ's, and the imperfect righteousness of sanctification which is our own.

"The one maintains: that the confessedly imperfect but inherent righteousness of sanctification justifies those, who, before the infusion of that heaven-born but in this world sin-intermingled quality, were among the impious or ungodly. The other maintains: that, although the imperfect and inherent righteousness of sanctification is ever present (as the writer of the Homily speaks) with those who are justified, yet it has no hand in procuring and effecting their justification; inasmuch as the one follows after the other, and therefore, in the very nature of things, cannot be its antecedent cause.

"The one is the system of Mr. Knox and the Church of Rome and the schoolmen. The other is the system of the Church of England and of all the other churches of the reformation."

But it is fairest to give "Mr. Knox's system" in his own words. He says:

"What I am impressed with, is: that our being reckoned righteous before God always and essentially implies a substance of righteousness *previously* implanted in us; and that our reputative justification is the strict and inseparable *result* of this previous efficient moral justification. I mean: that the reckoning us righteous indispensably presupposes an inward reality of righteousness, on which this reckoning is founded.

"They who stand, in contradistinction to those who are weak-hearted, and in opposition to those who fall, cannot be confounded with such as fluctuate between sin and repentance, and derive all their comfort, not from consciousness of the Redeemer's effectual grace within them, but from abstract reliance on what He did for them in the days of His flesh.

"In St. Paul's sense, to be justified is not simply to be accounted righteous, but also, *and in the first instance*, to be made righteous by the implantation of a radical principle of righteousness."

Upon this Mr. Faber remarks:

"Such, in his own words, is the system of Mr. Knox. So far as I can perceive, there is no difference between the doctrine advocated by him, and the doctrine propounded by the fathers of the council of Trent: a doctrine, however, it must be admitted, not altogether new; because it had been already advanced and maintained, by the master of the sentences in the twelfth century, and, with some improvement in the detail, by the angelic doctor in the thirteenth century.

"The speculation of all these different writers, from Peter Lombard, through Thomas Aquinas and the Tridentine divines, down to Mr. Knox, is briefly this: that man is justified before God; not by the extrinsic righteousness of Christ, faith being forensically imputed to him instead of a righteousness of his own which he possesses not; but by an intrinsic righteousness, which really as much belongs to him as his soul or his body belong to him, being inherently infused into him by God through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."

Mr. Faber shews that whatever subtle distinctions may be devised, the real difference is as to the procuring cause of justification. Are we justified by faith, in virtue of the sacrifice of Christ? or are we justified either by good works, as the blundering theologists assert, or by faith, according to the nicer definition, as being itself "practical Christianity?"

"Mr. Knox and the Tridentine fathers and the schoolmen, with whatever subtile distinctions and explanations, make the procuring cause of justification to be our own infused and therefore inherent or intrinsic righteousness.

"The Church of England, on the contrary, and all the other reformed churches, make the procuring cause of justification to be the extrinsic right-

eousness of Christ apprehended and appropriated by the instrumental hand of faith.

"With respect to the necessity of holiness, both in thought and in word and in work, as an indispensable qualification for the kingdom of heaven, all parties are agreed. But, when they come to treat of the place, which, in the economy of justification, is occupied by holiness, they differ considerably and indeed essentially: for this, in truth, is the hinge upon which turns the entire controversy.

"The one party make justification and sanctification substantially the same; man's sanctification by an infusion of inherent righteousness being no other than his intrinsic moral justification: and, on the ground of this intrinsic moral justification, as Mr. Knox theologises, man's chief hope is to be viewed as resting; or, as the divines of Trent speak, the inherent righteousness of moral justification is properly called our righteousness, because, through it inherent in us, we are justified: in their own precise words, Quia per eam nobis inhærentem justificamur.

"The other party, widely differing from their opponents, make sanctification, altogether, in point both of place and of ideality, distinct from justification: inasmuch as they define justification to precede sanctification; and thence, of course, by the very necessity of their arrangement, maintain, that sanctification, instead of being identical with and indeed the very essential constituent of justification, follows after it, and in truth never appears at all until the man shall first have been freely and forensically justified, by the alone perfect, and relatively to ourselves entirely extrinsic, righteousness of Christ."

We now come to the special point of discussion in Mr. Faber's volume:

"For each system alike, the authority of Scripture is claimed. And, what is is not a little remarkable, while the Church of England, even nominatim, appeals to the old ancient fathers, as affording the most decisive testimony that her system was the system of the Catholic Church from the beginning: the Church of Rome, through the organs of the Tridentine doctors, claims, though not nominatim, the successive lights of the church catholic, and, beyond them, nominatim, the Apostles and even Christ himself; Mr. Knox, the while, harmoniously alleging, on the base of a somewhat unexpected concession of Mr. Milner, that, from the end of the first century down to the day of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, the system, which stands opposed to his own, was unheard of and unrecognized."

With regard to Milner's "concession," as it is called, there is no doubt but that very early, justification, which is inseparably connected *in its effects* with sanctification, as faith is with good works, came to be frequently spoken of without that distinctness of statement which is so remarkable in the writings of St. Paul, and which was studiously followed by Protestant writers, in consequence of the controversies with the Church of Rome which had shewn how necessary it is to guard against mistake in a matter so important. But the extent of this error, as Mr. Faber abundantly proves, was not so great as Mr. Knox makes Milner suppose; but on the contrary there is a rich vein of Scriptural truth running through the writings of holy men of old, up to the period of the dominancy of the Romanist corruptions.

(*To be continued.*)

THE REV. M. M. PRESTON ON THE BENEFIT OF SCRIPTURAL INSTRUCTION.

The Benefit of Scriptural Instruction illustrated in the Case of two beloved Sons. By the Rev. M. M. PRESTON, M.A., Vicar of Cheshunt; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1837.

IN our Volume for 1836, p. 576, in noticing the Bible Society extracts for that month, we mentioned an affecting letter from the Rev. Mr. Preston, giving some account of a beloved child who had been taken early to his heavenly rest, and who upon his

death-bed had left his pocket money to that Society, to which his grateful parent added a handsome donation as a thank-offering to the God of the Bible. Another son has been since "received up into glory;" and the father, sorrowful yet rejoicing, is not willing that others should lose a portion of the instruction and consolation with which it has pleased God to visit himself and his household. Addressing his parishioners from the pulpit, he says:—

"It is only a fortnight, this day, 11th June, 1837, since I called your attention, my dear Brethren, to the declaration of Joshua, made before the assembled multitude of the Israelites—That whatever choice they might make, whether of the gods of Mesopotamia, where Abraham and his ancestors had resided, or of the gods of the Amorites, amongst whom they dwelt; his fixed purpose was, that he and his house should serve the Lord.

"In exhorting you, my dear friends—especially parents and heads of families,—to adopt without delay the same resolution, I suggested, as a reason for so doing, that it was not at all improbable that some of us might ere long be called to attend at the death-bed of one or another of those by whom we had rather hoped that our own eyes would be closed; and that our sorrow on such an occasion would be very bitter, if we should be conscious that—partly, at least, through our negligence—the departing soul had nothing to sustain it against the terrors of approaching death and judgment. I expressed a wish and prayer that you, in such circumstances, might know the opposite feelings of those who have received the dying testimony of their child, that God has answered their prayers and blessed their instruction to his soul's good, and that the Good Shepherd is bearing him in his bosom through the valley of the shadow of death.

"I knew not—(who does know what a day may bring forth!)—that I was soon to be taught, practically, what I was endeavouring to teach to others;—that Almighty God, in His providence—and, I trust, I may add, of his grace—was about to impress upon me, by further experience, the lessons which I then wished—and still wish, in dependence on His Holy Spirit—to impart to you.

"I was called on the very next day, Monday, to attend at the sick-bed, which proved to be the death-bed of a beloved son, in his seventeenth year; who was to have been one of the Confirmants from this parish at the approaching visit of the Bishop; and, with a view thereto, had attended the instructions of a Clergyman of the place, Chelsea, where he was a pupil at the Proprietary School. He had been confined to his bed a few days, having left his place at school the preceding Tuesday. But it was not till the day on which I saw him, that it was known that he was labouring under active inflammation of the lungs. He then felt himself to be, as he was, very ill; but not so distressingly ill as on the next day, when the respiration became so difficult, that it was deemed necessary to procure immediate relief by opening a vein. After that, he was able to converse collectedly;—and never was his understanding clearer. I did not think it necessary, or desirable, to state to him the extent of my own apprehensions respecting the dangerous character of the disease; nor, indeed, did I at that time abandon hope. But his own observation and feelings suggested to him, I believe, a correct view of his actual state. He had always invited communication from me on religious subjects, by the most respectful attention and teachableness: but at this time, and to the last, his confidence in me appeared to be unbounded; so that, I believe, he concealed nothing from me of his real feelings. In reply to a hope which I expressed that he was enabled at that time to commit himself without fear into the hands of God, he said, 'Certainly, I should prefer to live; but I trust I am prepared to die.' I told him there was nothing sinful in the wish to live:—and I prayed with him, that, if it were the will of God, He who alone gives skill to the physician and efficacy to medicine, would bless the means used to his restoration.

"I endeavoured to keep alive in him the hope of recovery, so long as it was possible: but, after a while, he needed not any one to tell him that, humanly speaking, the disease could not be arrested; and never, excepting that one time, did he intimate a wish to live. On the contrary, as his love to his Saviour increased, which it manifestly did every hour, and as his perception of the excellence of heavenly things grew clearer, he repeatedly expressed a longing desire to depart and to be with Christ. 'Oh,' said he, 'to be with Jesus! I long to be at the fountain of life!'—At another time: 'I long to be with Him, to be with Jesus! I long to be at home—Jerusalem, my happy home!"

"When questioned respecting the

ground of his hope toward God, it appeared that he was resting simply on the promise of the free remission of sins through the atonement made by the Lord Jesus. He said 'he had prayed to God to forgive him all his sins for Jesus Christ's sake; and he believed that He would.'

"The hymns to which he occasionally referred, and which he requested might be repeated to him, were chiefly those which set forth the sufficiency of the Sacrifice made for the sins of the whole world."

"There was, during his illness, a remarkable disclosure of spiritual views and Christian graces, previously formed, but imperfectly developed, which I could compare to nothing so illustrative of it, as what we are now witnessing during this late but delightful vernal season—the rapid expansion of beautiful and fragrant flowers, which were previously hid, or had only just peeped out of the calix, but have now burst upon us with more than their ordinary loveliness and sweetness. The light of God's countenance shone upon him, owning him as a child, adopted into His family through Jesus Christ; whom, not having seen, he loved with a glowing affection, which even added beauty to his countenance. — 'I love Him,' said he, 'with all my heart!' Yea, he appeared at times, almost to see Him. When his bodily sight grew dim, and he perceived it, and regarded it as a symptom of approaching death— 'But the spiritual light,' said he, 'is growing stronger.' —And soon did it brighten into perfect day. In this last expression, and in others, there was a delicacy and refinement—and, indeed, sublimity—of which the embryo elements might, perhaps, have been before imagined by a fond parent to exist in the mind of his child, but which now appeared to be surprisingly matured.—When I had left his side for a short time, he called to me, 'Papa, come to your place again: put your arm all its length under me. I want to pass from your bosom to my rest in heaven.' — 'My dear boy,' said I, 'the Everlasting Arms are underneath you—the Eternal God is with you.'—Mention was made of the crown which awaited the Redeemed in heaven. 'What,' I asked, 'will you do with your crown, when you receive it?" He instantly joined his hands; and then, throwing them forward with energy, replied, 'Cast it before the Throne, and sing His boundless praise.'

"As a specimen of aptness and propriety of address, I may mention what he said to a relative several years younger than himself, who came in to see him, and whom he wished to benefit by a word spoken in season. —'You must love God a great deal more. If you do not love God in the time of health, you will find it hard, very hard, to bear severe sickness. Be sure and beg of God, every night, to wash away your sins in the blood of Jesus Christ. Think of that. Beg of Him to give you His Holy Spirit. Do this; and then, when you get into bed, you will find it *so comfortable.*"

"Till the evening of the day before his death, no shadow of doubt was permitted to overcast his mind. Being fully persuaded that the confidence in God's mercy, through Christ, which he expressed, was well founded—for he had not then to *learn* the way of access to God through Jesus Christ—I felt it to be a matter of much thankfulness, that his sufferings, arising from severe bodily pain and burning thirst, were not aggravated by the unreasonable doubts which are sometimes permitted to harass even aged and experienced servants of Christ. Yet knowing the malice of Satan, whose time was now short, I did feel some apprehension that the sunshine of my child's soul might be clouded for a while; and so it was. Under the pressure, as it appeared, of increased bodily suffering, he felt distress coming over his mind; and, turning to me, requested that he might be left alone — 'alone with you, Papa.' When alone, he told me that he was distressed; that he did not feel that comfortable assurance which he had felt, that all was well with him; and he begged me to pray.—I assured him, that I fully believed that the depression of spirit proceeded from disease of body; and that his great enemy, who had no power really to injure him, was taking advantage of his weakness, so far as it was permitted to him, to harass him; but that God was on his side, and would not suffer one of the lambs, whom he had given to His Son, to perish:—and that he, having committed his soul into His hands, was assuredly one of his flock. I reminded him, that even his Redeemer had been similarly tempted, and had cried out, in agony, 'My God my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?" and that it was only a momentary hiding of the light of God's countenance, permitted for the trial of his faith.—He joined earnestly in the prayer which I then offered up; and very shortly the passing cloud was gone, and never returned. His gracious God knew what he could bear, and what he could not bear; and dealt with him accordingly, in tender mercy.

"When he thought, from the increasing sensation of faintness, that his end was very near, he requested me to com-

mit his soul to God in prayer.—'What shall I pray for in particular.' 'Pray that I may soon be with Him. Pray that I may see Him—that I may be washed in that precious blood—that my guilt may be cleansed in that blood—that, fighting "manfully under His banner, against the word, the flesh, and the devil," I may at last be with Him, and dwell with Him for ever.' He recovered, however, from that sinking, and requested me to read to him the 7th chapter of the Revelation.—'Shall I read the whole of the chapter?' 'Begin,' said he, 'at the 9th verse'—such was the correctness of his recollection of Scripture, even at this time."

"For a few hours before his death—which took place on Saturday morning, June 3, (yesterday week)—the violence of the disease, which had now nearly executed its commission, produced wandering and hallucination, which did not cease till he was beguiled through the dark valley, and joined to the spirits of the just made perfect."

Mr. Preston gives some highly honourable and affectionate testimonies to his departed son's character from his preceptors; and proceeds to impress upon his parishioners such solemn warnings and instructions as the affecting subject of his discourse suggested. For these we must refer to the discourse itself, which forms one of a volume of sermons to young persons, just published. It will, we are sure, be a bright reward to the pious writer, if it shall please God that the account of the blessed death-bed of his sons, and the other interesting particulars of his narrative, shall be sanctified to other parents and other children, so that his beloved children, being dead, may yet speak to the hearts of many; and with a voice the more solemn and impressive as it echoes from the tomb. These dying memorials are the best attestation to the Scriptural assiduity of the bereaved parent in training up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, while they also exhibit the faithfulness of God to his promises to those who do so. Some of the dying remarks of the elder of these youths are peculiarly beautiful. We ought to have added that this son, like his brother, left his purse to the Bible Society, "because," said he, "it is the best."

MURRAY ON THE VITAL PRINCIPLE.

Considerations on the Vital Principle, with a description of Mr. Crosse's Experiments. By JOHN MURRAY, F.S.A., &c.

SOME Divines have said, that an atheist must be a very rare monster, since no reasonable man can look around him and not discern abundant marks of creative power and wisdom. But these charitable writers do not allow for the vagaries of perverse ingenuity; for the atheist replies that the assumption of power and wisdom is just begging the question; for that what we call intentional adaptation, is merely one of the innumerable accidents of material agency, and that, had the facts been quite otherwise, there might have been sentient beings to whom that arrangement, or rather chance, would have been as congruous as the present to us. Thus a member of the French Academy of Sciences affirmed, that it is as ridiculous to suppose the eye made for seeing as stones for pelting; the properties of each being mere accidents. Absurd as such a notion is, it prevails to a considerable extent among men who, affecting untrammelled wisdom, have cooped up their intellect within the circle of physical science, and not allowed it to embrace the immaterial and moral world. On the continent of Europe

the doctrine is openly avowed; in England it is only not wholly concealed. We could mention numerous books, astronomical, geological, chemical, physiological, and pseudo-philosophical, which treat of things material and spiritual in a manner that is clearly intended to set aside the idea of a Supreme Creator and Governor. Things, we are told, are as they are; but how they came so, no one knows. This is the sum of Godless intelligence.

It is a mistake, therefore, to say there is no such a monster as an atheist; for there is no form of atheism which is not professed and vindicated. Even the senseless doctrine of appetency has still some followers. Thus we are often told in scientific works, that there is in animalization a tendency to assume certain forms, which is illustrated by the habits of various inanimate bodies to affect a certain structure of chrystallization; though why such "habits" grew up, the atheistical philosopher does not pretend to know. As one instance among many, the fore limb of animals is said to have a sort of natural type, from which all the deviations are superinduced by successive appetencies. Thus the arm of a man or an ape; the front leg of a horse or a lion; the wing of a bird; the fore fin of a whale or a dolphin; not to mention the corresponding members in extinct genera and species of fossil life; are all assumed to have a common type; a tendency to a certain form of joints and articulation; only that by appetency each in the course of billions of ages has taken a distinct modification, as habits and circumstances developed it in one particular direction; so that what in a man or a monkey comes to be an arm, in a pig or a cow is a leg, in an ostrich or a sparrow a wing, and in a sprat or a salmon a fin. Paley has exerted the strength of his Natural Theology against this irrational doctrine; and he dwells with an urgency which many who do not discern his object have considered disproportionate upon two cases, in which even an atheist cannot say that appetency could have any force; namely, in the instance of the valves in the arteries, and the strapping down of the ligaments at the ancle. A man might profess his belief that giraffes have browsed on trees, till by appetency, in the course of some millions of years, their necks have grown long, though they still retain the same type with their neighbours, not having more bones in that portion of their frame than the most short-necked animal. But even this credulous incredulist could not account for valves and straps which appetency has certainly no tendency to generate, but which, he must allow, answer an important office.

Another atheistical fancy is equivocal production. The Bible tells us that when God made man and the inferior animals, he said that they were to increase and multiply, and replenish the earth. But atheism says that vegetable or animal life is a mere lucky accident; and that, without any creative force, new races of organized beings, sentient and non-sentient, may and will from time to time arise. This anti-philosophical dream has been long ago exploded; so that even when upon the soil extracted from three hundred feet below the surface, in boring an Artesian well, forms of vegetable life display themselves which are not known in the place where the experiment is tried, the soundest philosophers admit that the seeds were deposited in the soil, and that they required only the stimuli of warmth, light, moisture, and so forth, to urge them into action. The same re-

mark applies to numerous other cases. There are considerable difficulties attending the question; but no reflecting man doubts that the seed was there, and that this seed was the produce of a former plant according to the ordinary modes of vegetable propagation. Yet this anti-philosophical atheistical dream of equivocal production has been of late revived; and the remarkable experiments of Mr. Crosse have been seized upon to prove that the phllosopher of Somersetshire has actually produced a new creation; and some airy dreamers, assuming the doctrine that organization is life, predict that science may eventually make such progress, that, so far as principle is concerned there is no animal or vegetable production that may not be manufactured in a laboratory, as much as Mr. Crosse's mites. We are to believe that some unexpected application of electro-magnetism or voltaism, (we should say Voltairism) might, in time, and with due skill, turn limestone rocks into blackbirds: and who can say how soon cooks, and butchers, and graziers will doze at their fire side, while some chemical philosopher, with his wonder working wand, furnishes out a banquet at Guildhall, of all possible flavours and varieties, to entertain some future queen of England, without any expense to the good citizens, beyond a few ounces of acid and alkali.

We have said sufficient to introduce to our readers Mr. Murray's account of Mr. Crosse's very remarkable and interesting experiments. The facts are well established, and no satisfactory explanation has been given of whence these insects came; but that they were not hatched from eggs, but newly created by chemical agency, without the existence of any animated predecessor, is a wild dream which no sane person can listen to.

We will now string together a series of passages from Mr. Murray's pamphlet.

"The painful impression made on my own mind, with the mischievous effects which I too well know were produced on the minds of others, by the false and fictitious statements which appeared in the public newspapers some months ago, purporting to be descriptive of Mr. Crosse's experiments, induced me to call on that gentleman at his seat, near Taunton, (though at considerable inconvenience and expense,) for the purpose of satisfying myself, from personal inspection and investigation, of the truth of the assertions and allegations. According to these statements, the galvanic agent or electricity was neither more nor less than the *vis formatrix*, and Mr. Crosse the skilful director of the said power. Now, it seemed obvious to me that this was *atheism* with a witness, and it is well to call things by their real and right names. No man of plain sense or common understanding can otherwise than readily discern, that if Mr. Crosse, or any other person, could make, form, or create—for these are, when rightly interpreted, synonimous terms—by any material means whatever, or any agent in existence over which man has controul, the most minute or meanest animalcule in the microcosm of being, an extension or modification of the same means might form an elephant or a rhinoceros, or even 'that prodigy of parts,' as Locke calls him—MAN.—I am sorry to be compelled to add, that I believe Mr. Crosse is labouring under strong mental delusion—like Katerfelto,

'At his own wonders wondering.'

"I trust that these 'Considerations' will prove not altogether unseasonable—re-assure many, and in some small measure operate as a check on the fanciful, wild, and visionary speculations that are unhappily but too prevalent in modern times. On the Continent these are openly and recklessly promulgated in the writings and public prelections of the Scavans of France. Not to mention De la Lande, Laplace, and others, we may cite from those of even more recent date, and some yet alive, as evidence for our assertions;—for instance, that of Lamark, that animals form their own organs! and that of St. Hillaire, St. Vincent, and others, who tell us—'credat Judæus!'—that animals and plants are mutually convertible things, that the earth is saturated with a 'vegeto-animal principle,' which may become, as it lists, a vegetable or an animal. Is it too much to say of the

authors of these mental aberrations,—'professing themselves wise, they become fools?' Not long ago a celebrated professor in one of the public schools of France, Mr. T——, a chemist of no mean celebrity, gravely assured his pupils that the time would come when man might, from a more advanced state of chemical science, be able to manufacture plants and animals at will..... It is only a few years ago, that a medal was awarded by one of the learned academies of France for the formation of embryons by electric currents! Mr. Crosse need wonder no more.

"Unfortunately, we are not without the contagion of these atheistical speculations and opinions in this country, though they may have assumed a less overt form, not being as yet altogether prepared by the rejection of a God, and the restraints of Revelation, unblushingly to say with 'the fool' in 'our hearts,' that 'there is no God.' Yet I must nevertheless confess that 'spontaneous generation,' 'merorganization,' another version of 'a provisional creation waiting to be organized,' together with the 'successive developments' of the geologist, and the 'morphology' of the botanist, 'innate vitality of atoms,' &c., are in my opinion not far removed from unsophisticated atheism.

"I should be chargeable with ingratitude did I not acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Crosse for his courtesy and kindness, and the frank manner in which he received me, and communicated his results. There was certainly no attempt at concealment,—and every explanation was afforded; but as the error is a most serious one—tremendous, indeed, in its magnitude, and of incalculable importance—the duty to denounce it, is imperative. Had it been a question of theory, and related to something *adhuc sub judice*, it might have been left to its own weight; but when pseudo-philosophers, on the most flippant grounds imaginable, or rather in the total absence of all justifiable pretext, seem anxious to establish the belief of a universe without a God,—design without a designer, laws without a lawgiver,—the effects of beauty, order, and harmony, without any cause for their production, it is high time for us to bestir ourselves."

"The newspapers announced that Mr. Crosse, of Broomfield, near Taunton, had made some remarkable discoveries in galvanism; that where he had expected to see crystals of silica, he had found insects, &c. Sometimes these were called animalculæ, and it was also mentioned that the said animalculæ fed on flint, and lived in a medium of hydrochloric or muriatic acid;—that the flints used had been calcined, being made more than red hot, and subsequently saturated with muriatic acid. It was, moreover, added, that the animalculæ were developed in considerable numbers within the coil of the platinum wire connected with the negative end of a galvanic battery, resting on a volcanic slag from Vesuvius. All this seemed 'strange,—wonderous strange,' and muriatic acid, and red hot flints, and Vesuvian lava, were such formidable and 'fiery' circumstances, that the world might well wonder. It was further added, that Mr. Farraday had obtained the same results, and of course verified the marvels of Mr. Crosse. Before I proceed, however, to state the matter precisely as it really is, and which personal observation and examination have enabled me to do, I shall give Mr. Farraday's letter on the subject, to the editors of the 'Times' and 'Standard' newspapers, which sets the matter to rest as far as his name is concerned.

"'I am reported to have said, that by experiment I have fully confirmed the extraordinary results of Mr. Crosse, who states that he has obtained living insects by the agency of electricity and silica, &c. What I said was almost the reverse of this, for I merely stated, upon the occasion of the insects being shown by Mr. Clift and Mr. Owen, at the Royal Institution, that we wished to be distinctly understood, we had no opinion to give respecting the mode of their production. My impression is, that the electricity and the silica are merely accidental circumstances in relation to the production of the insects, and not essentials, and I have refrained from experiments, because I thought it only just to Mr. Crosse, that he should be allowed the opportunity, by further trials in close vessels, and with other precautions that will easily suggest themselves, either to correct his views, if they need correction, or to add that clear and confirmatory evidence which the subject at present requires."

"Mr. Crosse used in his manipulations a galvanic trough, composed of 19 pairs of 5-inch plates, slightly acidulated with muriatic acid. The connecting poles terminating in platinum wires, rested on a portion of 'lava,' or the ferruginous mass, superficially tinged with protoxyde and peroxyde of iron—the platinum wires had no coils at their extremities, and were three or four inches asunder. The lava alluded to rested in the neck of a glass funnel, and the stem of this funnel entered a common green glass bottle. A stage was erected over the whole, and passing through an

opening in its shelf was a Wedgewood's funnel containing a shallow porcelain dish, with a solution of silicated potassa, (sometimes muriatic acid being added to it,) a slip of moist flannel dipping into the solution, its greater length passing over the lip of the basin, acted on the principle of the syphon, and occasioned an incessant dripping on the volcanic slag, so that its surface was preserved constantly moist, while the surplus fell into the green bottle beneath. Such was the arrangement, and I also observed the evolution of the insects, for they are not animalculæ; belonging as they do to a higher order of animated forms. Now from this statement, which is a correct description of the whole affair, I defy any one to say whether galvanism or the silica, potassa or hydrochloric acid, or the water employed in the solution, or the flannel, or the slag, or the atmosphere, or all conjoined, were accessaries in the production of these insects, or what share each or all of them had in the phenomena."

"I examined a specimen of this insect in its fully matured form, in a good microscope, belonging to Mr. Crosse, which, however, though preserved by Canada balsam, was *imperfect*; still, it convinced me that it was an acarus; a genus, the pest of the entomologist, and the annoyance of the house-wife. It was bristled with hairs, pili or setæ, and so far, i. e. from the profusion of this armour, differed from the common cheese mite; perhaps, therefore, acarus crinitus might be the specific name, as appropriate for it. According to the account given me by Mr. Crosse, these insects were gradually developed at the earliest in a month; he also informed me that he had obtained them from the following substances:—silicated potassa; silicated potassa saturated with muriatic acid; saturated solution of nitrate of copper; water and oxyde of copper, and solution of sulphate of zinc. It is quite evident from these facts, that they are not the exclusive gift of silica.... That an acarus is not an animalcule is evident; and it may be added, that though hatched as the ova of other insects may be, on the moist surface of the support of the galvanic wires, the perfect insect is drowned in water, as other mites assuredly are. Some of the insects have four, and others eight feet, and from the account given it is clear to demonstration that these acari, for there may be more than one species, are regularly produced like other acari from ova, and that the various appearances presented on the surface of the lava are so many different states of evolution, just as we perceive to be the case in the transformations of insect life in a thousand instances, many of which are far more wonderful than the phenomena of these acari.... The gordius, or 'horse hair eel,' has been considered, in vulgar estimation, as an animated horse hair, and a person of the name of Maceroni, who seems to be quite delighted with 'Mr. Crosse's production of life by galvanism'! considers that 'electricity and vitality are identical'!! and believing that horse hairs might be converted into eels, or some other animals, by galvanism, accordingly presented Dr. Forster with some of these hairs for the purpose of supplying this new manufacture with the material: according to Dr. Forster, in three months they were expanded to the size of a straw, rather an indefinite term, for I have seen a culm not thicker than a horse hair,—the stem of the scirpus capillaris is not thicker, and the stipa pennata in the early period of its growth not more than half this size—however, according to Maceroni, the said tumescent hair was animated!"

"I do not deny that organic forms may exist in flints, or silicious structures. I have echini and a vast variety of testaceous bodies, &c., taken from and found imbedded in flints, and that there may be others of microscopic minuteness, it is quite reasonable to infer.... It is quite conceivable how the ova of insect and other life might be hermetically sealed up in a cerement of flint, and on its mechanical disintegration, or even chemical separation of parts, be liberated and live, when submitted to the agencies of heat and air, and other accessaries. Why should we wonder 'as if some strange thing had happened?' It is not more wonderful than that of various seeds, after their repose of 2 or 3000 years within the body of the mummy, or in the mummy case, which have in repeated instances germinated; but though this is admitted, it is not so evident that an organized structure could sustain the temperature of a white heat to which the flints, in their calcination, may have been subjected, though, as will hereafter appear, vegetable and animal life will support occasionally incredible temperatures without being destroyed. It is quite clear, however, the silicious matter in Mr. Crosse's experiments has nothing whatever to do with this acarus; and Mr. T. observes, 'I am well acquainted with the ova of some mites, and have seen nothing like them in flint.' Mr. Lonsdale, the eminent curator of the Geological Society, of London, has in like manner discovered that chalk consists of an aggregation of the most minute organic forms. Tripoli stone seems composed of innumerable

animalculæ, or their exuviæ that are sometimes supplied with shields, or corslets of flint, subsequently deposited. In the article 'Microscope,' in the last edition of the 'Encyclop. Britan.,' it is stated that a single animalcule in siliceous rock measures 13456th inch; a cubic inch of the polishing slate of Bilin contains 41,000 millions, and a single grain weight, 187 millions.

"Respecting galvanism, as far as chemical research has extended, we know the limits of its powers. It cannot change in any way the ultimate forms into which compounds may be resolved; therefore the animalcular or insect ova, must be altogether distinct from the inorganic matter in which they are imbedded. It decomposes inorganic matter into its elements, or remodels its structure, or recomposes the salt, or other compounds, by associating its elements; but there is superadded to living organic forms, a vis vitæ, or punctum saliens, the greater gift of creative intelligence;—'the inspiration of the Almighty.' The same electric power which resolves the compound into its proximate parts, or finally reduces it into elemental constituents, may aid, like regulated temperature in hatching the ova, and promoting the evolution and growth of insect life;—since it is certain that electricity favours the growth of plants, and powerfully promotes the germination of seeds, and evolution of the larvæ from the ova of the silk-worm, and other insects....It is by no means inconceivable that animalcular or insect ova might by possibility be associated with silicic acid, as animalculæ are with acetous acid, e. g. the bifurcate-tailed eels in vinegar. This being their matrix and cerement, the ova might continue dormant till liberated by the decomposition of the silicate or silica. It is monstrous to suppose that any physical power known to man, whether electricity or any other, could not only build up a curious and complicated structure, but infuse into its mechanism the vis vitæ."

"The sum of the whole matter, as far as Mr. Crosse's experiments are concerned, is simply this—The ova of the acarus derived from some of the sources mentioned, are hatched by the electricity of the galvanic battery."

"It ought never to be forgotten, in our estimate of these phenomena, that similar organised beings invariably make their appearance under similar circumstances—such as the eels in paste, and the fork-tailed eels in vinegar—infusions of pepper, hay, &c., 'Each after its kind.' This is also shewn in specimens of water obtained from various sources, and seen in the solar, or in the oxyhydrogene microscope."

"It is not reasonable to suppose that new forms are springing up around us. Creation, with regard to the present constituted order of things, had a limit, and we have no grounds to believe that one figure has been added to its lists, since the creative fiat passed over it, 'in the beginning.' The minutiæ of creation escape us from their extreme minuteness, and cannot be so successfully studied and pursued through all their intricacies, windings, and mutations; but why should we confine the question to animalcular or insect life? Let the laws of hybridism be taken into the account; nor ought we to rest satisfied with lower links, when we might with equal propriety take the case of larger animals, and reason analogically from them; and if not in them, why should we suspect it in inferior or in particular links of an identical chain of being? Then again, only a particular plant, or particular plants, make their appearance on turning up the long neglected soil, or in the excavations of the quarry or the mine. But why, it may be rejoined, not multitudinous myriads of unknown and unnumbered kinds? White clover springs up in patches on the blasted heath, when 'ashes' are sprinkled over the surface, but the alkaline matter of 'ashes' is known to be a powerful stimulus to vegetation, and to rouse the dormant powers of the seeds that repose in the soil. This is the case too with the 'fire weed' of America, which springs up when brush-wood is consumed. It is thus with the Phormium tenax of New Zealand; when the natives commit the seed to the earth, and it does not in due time make its appearance above ground, brush-wood is scattered on the surface, and set fire to, and in that case the young plants soon emerge from the soil. A lake dries up and a particular plant springs up in myriads and usurps the soil, because many seeds will not germinate at all under water, and may remain for centuries and for ages dormant in the bottom of the lake. Yes, all these, thus naturally and easily explained, conformable to observation and direct experiment, have been brought forward in support of the atheistical notion—'Spontaneous generation.'"

"'What the vital principle is, or where it lies concealed, I presume not to know. Like its Almighty Author, 'no man hath seen it at any time;' yet it puts all in motion, and regulates, in perfect isochronism, the movements of the ma-

chinery of animal and vegetable organization."

"We remember the time when the fact of the fall of meteoric stones was stoutly contested and boldly denied, simply from the difficulty of accounting for the phenomenon, which seemed, as Hume phrases it, to be 'a transgression of the laws of Nature.' The truth of this fact is now, however, incontrovertibly established, and is no longer debated by any one, however various the opinions may be that are entertained in explaining the phenomenon."

These passages contain so many remarkable facts, that we were unwilling to withhold them from our readers. Mr. Murray deserves the public gratitude for exposing this pseudo-philosophical atheism to the light of day, and for shewing on what a quicksand the whole system rests. If fools will say in books what they have always said in their hearts—that there is no God, in books they must be answered; and at the present moment, when so much is urged respecting popular scientific education, it is not superfluous to expose the efforts which are making to poison science at its fountain head, and to ruin men's souls under the hollow pretence of enlarging their understandings.

OBITUARY.

THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS BURGESS, D.D., LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

THE continuation of the memoirs of Mr. Simeon, Professor Farish, and others, through several numbers of our last volume, prevented our accomplishing the intention of laying before our readers some account of our late venerable friend Bishop Burgess; of whom, from the affectionate personal recollections of more than a quarter of a century, and a general knowledge of his life and writings, we might say much, were it not that the pleasing task of drawing up a full account of him, has fallen to the lot of his friend Mr. Hartford of Blaize Castle, the much respected and munificent co-founder of St. David's college, to whom the bishop consigned his papers. We wait with pleasing expectation the appearance of Mr. Hartford's publication; but in the mean time we will not deny ourselves the pleasure of collecting a few memoranda of this excellent prelate, whose long and diligent life was devoted to sacred studies; more especially with a view to the benefit of the younger clergy; and whose name, even were all his other claims to public gratitude forgotten—were his Biblical labours, his profound and elegant learning; his zeal for the circulation of the Word of God; his exertions for the defence of our revered Church and of our common Protestantism; his benevolent efforts on behalf of the poor, the ignorant, nay, even the despised slave; his amiable deportment; his personal piety, to lapse from remembrance—would still live as the revered Bishop Bedell of the Principality of Wales, so long as the invaluable institution of St. David's College shall remain to testify his enlightened and pious munificence. The author of some hundred and thirty publications, many of them volumes of great labour and research, deserves an honourable niche in the literature of his country. He once told us that he scarcely recollected having ever been three months in a place without employing the press; and some of his publications bear the rude marks of provincial typography. His great aim was usefulness. But of his books more hereafter; of the writer we need only say, that he was a man of the primitive type; a man of peace, of prayer, of study, of humility, and of mortification; a man such as is not often seen in these days of secularity and moral rail-road innovation. We did not concur with him in every opinion, even upon matters of importance; but we rejoice to bear this unfeigned testimony to his Christian virtues.

We observe that we have instinctively let fall the expression "a man of peace," which may sound strangely to some who knew him only as a theological polemic; but we see no need upon re-consideration to qualify the phrase: for even in contending earnestly for what he considered truth, the utmost pertinacity of purpose was never deformed by harshness or invective. But we were thinking rather of his meek eye, his gentle voice, his condescending

words, his humble demeanour, than of his writings, and truly will all who knew him attest that "the law of kindness" was on his lips. The archdeacon of Salisbury, the venerable Francis Lear, who delivered a beautiful and instructive sermon upon occasion of his decease, took for his text that blessed promise, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee;" and in speaking of the bishop applied it to him as follows:

"The Peace of which we have been speaking, was largely vouchsafed to our late venerable Diocesan; he was one whose mind was stayed on God, and who was, according to the gracious promise in the text, kept by that God in perfect peace. He was emphatically a man of peace; I appeal to all who were in the habit of conversing with him, and who really knew his character, if I am not fully justified in using that term. There was a something in his manner and appearance, nay, even in the very sound of his voice, which spoke of peace; all was calm and quiet around him and within him; the world, with its noise and its restlessness, was ever shut out; he heard of it only as we may hear the roar of the stormy ocean, borne to us by the wind from afar; he had no heart for its turmoils, no hand in its schemes, and seldom turned so much as a look towards its commotions. The same stillness prevailed in his dwelling which reigned in the mind of its owner: his was a calm which seemed to spread itself from his own heart to the hearts of those with whom he held converse. I do not think that the most ruffled spirit could have remained in his presence without being tranquillized; there was a serenity in his manner which would have acted as oil on the troubled waters; all that was disturbed and violent would, if brought in contact with one so placid, have died away.....There is a peace which the world giveth, and which they that are of the world enjoy; there is a peace which a naturally placid temper gives; and there is a peace which arises from mere outward prosperity....Sadly indeed do they mistake, and awfully will they be deceived, who suppose that a state of mind so low, so earthly, and so unspiritual, will bring a man peace at the last! But how different was that peace which he of whom I speak enjoyed! It sprang from far other sources, it rested on quite another foundation, it had respect to a far other recompence; it had, as I firmly believe, the Holy Spirit for its author, Christ for its rock, and Heaven for its end."

Our recollections, then, did but echo those of his friend, Archdeacon Lear, when we wrote of him as "a man of peace." We remember, in one of those quiet summer evening calls with which, in years past, he used sometimes to favour us, when he was rusticating in London, passing a sort of bachelor life between the libraries and his hotel or retired lodging, studying some new proof of the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, or of St. Paul having visited Britain *—

* We will note down here, lest we forget it hereafter, a circumstance, which, if left unexplained, may perplex some future antiquary, and perhaps be gravely adduced centuries hence as a certain proof of what is not improbable, that St. Paul did really visit Great Britain. Lord Teignmouth, in his Life of Sir William Jones, explained the circumstances of a literary fraud which had deceived his erudite friend; a learned Hindoo having dexterously introduced into a Sanscrit manuscript a spurious sheet, discoloured for deception, narrating a story which, Sir W. Jones states in the Asiatic Researches, presents a remarkable coincidence with the inspired account of Noah and the deluge. Notwithstanding Lord Teignmouth's exposure of the fraud, the story has been repeated in sermons and elsewhere, so difficult is it to rectify what has been once printed and published; many seeing the incorrect statement who never hear of the rectification. We think it therefore a duty to clear up a circumstance which was mentioned, we believe in some publications at the time, but without the subsequent correction, and may, perhaps, ages hence be appealed to by some sanguine antiquary when it is too late to ascertain the truth.

The good bishop one day accosted us as follows, (the reader is requested to pardon the awkward pluralism of periodical literature):—"You know how strongly I have maintained that St. Paul visited Britain, but I little thought that he had preached in my own diocese and neighbourhood." His lordship went on to relate that on the eighth of March (it was in the year 1825), in making some excavations in the parish of Mothvey, in Carmarthenshire, not many miles from his own episcopal residence of Aberguilly, a stone was dug up, upon which there was a rude inscription in bad Welch, purporting, so far as it could be deciphered by an eminent Cambrian scholar (whom he named), that St. Paul preached on that spot in the year LXIX., and that Ap Elim ap Owen the Red had been put to death on the same spot in the year 1604, for preach-

he found us writing the family sermon on Job xxii. 21, "Acquaint thyself with God, and be at peace," which appeared in our number for June, 1824, and afterwards in the volume of "Forty Family Sermons," which was printed partly at his suggestion, as he said that one of his first discoveries that his eye-sight was failing, was when he could not easily read the Christian Observer Family Sermons, as he had been accustomed to do, to his household, and he thought a selection from them, in a large type, might be useful. There is nothing particular in the sermon; but it led to an interesting conversation upon Christian peace; the enmity of the unregenerate heart to God; the way of peace through Christ; the fruits of peace, its blessedness, and the like. He said that in all his Scripture readings he had never before remarked that text; he considered it very striking; and when we saw him not long after, he added that he had been frequently thinking over the subject, that acquaintance with God was truly the source of peace, and that he had spoken about it to his servant.

---

ing Christ. The stone, more valuable than that of Rosetta, he said was in the hands of the lithographer, and in a few days we should have a fac-simile of it. We submitted to him with great respect, but with as much earnestness as we could venture, upon seeing how implicitly he credited the tale, and how impatient he was of any doubt being suggested—though he himself thought the date wrong—to get the most solemn attestations in writing from all the parties who were present at the discovery, before he committed himself to the authenticity of the relic; placing our suggestion upon the modest ground that if the testimonies proved sufficient, copies of them should be enshrined in the British Museum, the Bodleian, and other libraries. In a few days he called on us with the lithograph, which is before our eyes at this moment while we are writing. We need not say that the document proved to be a fabrication. The young gentleman who had planned the fraud in sport, from knowing the bishop's opinions, finding the matter becoming serious, caused it to be explained. But in the meantime his lordship had mentioned it to his clerical and literary friends, and, if we recollect rightly, at a meeting of the Society of Literature; the public press also noticed it; and copies of the lithograph had gone abroad; and our own is probably not the only one that escaped his recollection in destroying the impression.

We had some doubts about narrating this incident; but as the story is still on record, the solution ought not to be withheld; besides which, it exhibits the remarkable simplicity of the bishop's character; for, guileless himself, he could not impute guile to others. Simplicity, even to rusticity, was the object of his admiration. We remember, in 1824, in consequence of our having introduced to him Bishop Hobart and Bishop Chase, his remarking to us to the effect of, "I was much obliged to you for bringing Bishop Chase to see me. Bishop Hobart is a clever literary man, but one can see many such in London; but Bishop Chase interested me by his singular simplicity."

We have digressed at the mention of the characteristic word "peace;" but the better way would have been to have first given the brief outline of the chief events of his life, and have left a general sketch of his character to the last; but as there is most pleasure in reading of those whom we are prepared to love, the digression may not be impertinent to the narrative.

Dr. Burgess was the son of Mr. William Burgess, a respectable retail tradesman at Odiham, in Hampshire, where the Bishop was born on the 19th of November, 1756. His father, we have heard, was a man of a devout spirit, who brought up his children in the fear of God. Young Burgess commenced his education at the grammar school of Odiham, whence he was removed to Winchester, where he stood for, and obtained, a Scholarship at Corpus Christi college, Oxford, and was matriculated in 1775, being then of the age of eighteen years. In 1779, he took his B.A. degree; in 1780, obtained the prize for the Chancellor's English Essay, "On the Study of Antiquities;" and proceeded to the degree of M.A. in 1782. Before taking his bachelor's degree, he distinguished himself by publishing Burton's Pentalogia, with additional and learned notes, and a very improved Index Græcitatis. Soon after he acquired great reputation as a scholar by an Edition of Dawes' Miscellanea Critica, with a learned Appendix. In 1783 he was elected Fellow of Corpus, in the room of the late Dr. King, Bishop of Rochester; and shortly after Tutor, which important situation he retained till 1791. He was successively ordained to Deacon's and Priest's Orders, by the Bishop of Winchester, in the year 1784.

Before proceeding to further particulars of the Bishop's life, we will corroborate and enlarge our cursory notices, by two extracts from letters respecting him, and by one from himself. We are favoured with the following information

by a venerated individual, in reply to an inquiry respecting some particulars of the lamented Prelate's early history :—

"The late Bishop of Salisbury had left Winchester School, before I went there—and I do not recollect to have heard any thing of him before I was introduced to him shortly after my being placed at Oxford. I think that at that time he had just taken his Master's degree—and was one of the Tutors of Corpus Christi college. His reputation as a scholar stood high in the University; but I can say no more than that he was very kind to young men who showed a disposition to study, and was always ready to assist them with his advice. I used frequently to sup with him while I was an undergraduate: and the acquaintance which there commenced was continued to his death, but without bringing us so much together as to give me an opportunity of observing his habits in private life. It may be needless to add, that the respect which I conceived for his learning and piety when I was a young man increased with the advance of years, and that for a very long period I had the satisfaction of calling him a friend. I doubt very much whether there are any memorials of the late venerable Bishop's life.—The late ———, was one of his most intimate friends, but I question whether he has left any written particulars."

Our next extract is from a communication addressed to us by one whose elegant pen, as a gentleman of letters, is exceeded only by his far higher qualifications as a man and a Christian. The latter part of the letter goes beyond the date at which our remarks have arrived, but we will not divide it.

"My Dear Friend,—It does appear strange that having been on terms of most friendly intercourse with Bishop Burgess, from the age of sixteen, I should have nothing special to communicate concerning him. His career through this vain and stirring world, seems to have been singularly uniform and quiet. I was first introduced to his acquaintance in the year 1784, when I entered under his tuition as a Scholar of Corpus Christi college, Oxon. He was then Master of Arts, and the Tutor of the college. He held that situation for many years, greatly valued for his talents and assiduity in the sphere in which he moved, and much admired and esteemed by all persons interested in the promotion of sound and elegant literature at home and abroad; but his deportment was so modest, and his habits were so retiring, that his merit procured him much less public notice than others have attracted with much inferior pretensions. His acquaintance with Greek literature was acknowledged to be very profound; but had he not fallen under the eye of Bishop Barrington, who had a peculiar pleasure in discovering and rewarding unambitious merit, his feet would probably have rarely stepped out of classic ground, and the walks of the Academy. Bishop Barrington, as you know, made him his chaplain, and collated him, in 1787, to a prebend in Salisbury cathedral; and when he was translated to the See of Durham, he carried Mr. Burgess with him, and installed him in his Cathedral there. He owed his episcopal preferment to Lord Sidmouth, who, I believe, had known him at Winchester School, and always professed a very high opinion of his abilities, the extent of his knowledge, and the rectitude of his principles. And he once told me, in a conversation I had with his lordship on the subject, that when the vacancy on the Episcopal Bench put into his hands the power of recommending to that high situation, he was induced to select the Rev. Thomas Burgess, by his conviction alone, without any application being made to him in his behalf, that his deep and sincere piety, coupled with his great attainments in sacred literature, qualified him above any other man to succeed to the dignity. The manner in which he fulfilled the duties of his important charge, few men know better than yourself, &c. During the interval between his promotion to St. David's, and his removal to Salisbury, the literature and theology of his country were enriched by many able productions of his intellect, with all which I know you are well acquainted, and particularly his tracts in illustration of the grand truth of the divinity of our Lord, and in defence of the controverted verse of St. John, chap. v. 7; on which last subject he has displayed great erudition and power of argument; and has, in the judgment of many eminent Christian scholars, succeeded in establishing his great point."

The following letter, addressed by the Bishop to the late Mr. Nichols, will explain itself :—

"Abergwilly Palace,
"March 27, 1815.

"Dear Sir,—Your additional volume to the Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century affords me an opportunity, which I am unwilling to lose, of communicating to you an instance of Mr. Tyrwhitt's benevolence and love of learning. Soon after I had published Dawes's 'Miscellanea Critica,' and was entering on the term in which I was to

take my Master's degree, I told him it was my intention to take a curacy in the country, till I should be called again to College to serve those offices which are usually held by the Fellows in rotation. He said, 'You must not leave College. In the country, and with your new duties, you would not have those means and opportunities of pursuing your old studies, which the University possesses above all other places. You shall be my curate. I will beg you to accept annually from me what will be equivalent to a curate's stipend.' I accepted his generous offer, and remained at College. I was soon after appointed to the office of College Tutor. But Mr. Tyrwhitt continued his annual present, till the emolument of my office enabled me to relinquish a gratuity, which I knew he would bestow on some *protegé* who wanted it more than myself. The literary advantages which I derived from my continuance at College at that time, and, of course, my obligations to my generous friend, are greater than I can express to you. Mr. Tyrwhitt died in 1786. By his will he left me a kind remembrance of his friendship, in a legacy of 100*l.*—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully, T. ST. DAVID'S."

We ought not to omit to state, that up to the bishop's taking holy orders, and, perhaps, for some time after, though we have reason to believe, from his own testimony, that he lived in the fear of God, and his conduct, we know, was moral and exemplary; yet, that his feelings of ambition for pre-eminence as a scholar, were much more intense than his convictions of clerical responsibility. Gradually, however, the course of reading which he pursued was made instrumental, by the blessing of God, to the spiritual illumination of his mind; and even before he gave up the tutorship of his college, he diligently employed himself in the composition of religious tracts for the poor, and in compiling catechisms and useful manuals for Sunday schools. We mention these facts as illustrative of the zeal with which, at an early period of his clerical career, he applied himself, to the best of his light and knowledge, to the great work of glorifying God, and doing good to his fellow-creatures.

(*To be continued.*)

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

ANOTHER eventful year has passed by, and is "numbered with the days beyond the flood." It commenced with a ravaging epidemic; it witnessed in its course the demise of our late respected Monarch, and the accession of our youthful, amiable, and beloved Queen—whom God in his mercy long preserve and bless;—and it has closed with the painful tidings of an insurrection in an important trans-Atlantic colony, attended by fearful scenes of desolation and carnage. Thus chequered are the affairs of nations as well as individuals; and truly we know not what a day may bring forth. May the memento lead us to apply our hearts to wisdom; and through the infinite merits of our Redeemer, to seek treasure in that world where there is no change or decay.

We proceed to touch upon a few particulars of passing events.

The chief business of the *recent* meeting of parliament, has been to legislate respecting the civil list, which being prospective during a reign that, in the order of nature, may last more than half a century, was *not* a trifling consideration. The two leading sections of parliament agreed to follow, as nearly as possible, the precedent of the late reign; so that our gracious queen, like her ancestors, will preside over a splendid court, and have the means of powerfully influencing the nation by her character and example. We earnestly pray that God will keep her from the snares of youth and royalty, and ever dispose her heart to acknowledge him in all her ways, and to seek the best welfare, spiritual as well as temporal, of her dutiful and affectionate subjects.

We are reminded, by the date at which this will reach the eye of our readers, of two legislative enactments, which will begin to take effect from that day.

The first is the Act for the Amendment of the Law of Wills. This important act, which is founded upon the Report of the Real Property Commissioners, has effected many salutary alterations in the law of testamentary disposition; and simplified and rendered uniform the old intricate rules for the execution of Wills. Many of the particulars are too technical for our columns; but every person should be aware, and intelligent persons, especially the clergy, should inform their neighbours, that, in future Wills, in order to be valid, must be in writing, and be signed at the end by the testator, or by some other person in his presence, and under his direction; and the signature must

be made or acknowledged by the testator in the presence of not less than two witnesses, who must attest and subscribe the Will in his presence. No particular form of attestation is necessary. Alterations in Wills are to be executed in the same manner as Wills. By this Act, a Will is revoked by marriage, whether there are children or not. Two witnesses are now required for Wills bequeathing personal property; and two will suffice for real property. Several papers were published in the Christian Observer some years ago, upon the duty of making a Will; those who have already executed that duty are not affected by the new provisions; but those who have not, will do well to bethink them of their mortality, and of what they owe to justice, and to the peace of those who shall come after them, and no longer to neglect this solemn obligation. The making a will may be rendered a very salutary new year's occupation; as though a voice said from above, Set thy house in order, for this year thou shalt die.

The second enactment to which we alluded, is the excellent Act for prohibiting secular notices in churches. The readers of our New Series will be spared the many complaints which we have urged before their predecessors upon the Sabbath desecration, and impediment to the solemn worship of God, caused by these intrusive announcements. We rejoice that they are now at an end.

A recent parliamentary regulation, which prohibits a long notice of a proposed motion, has probably prevented the announcement of any intended measure for the better observance of the Lord's Day; but the subject has not been lost sight of, and we trust we may say that Mr. Plumptre is likely to urge it upon the serious attention of Parliament. It is of the utmost importance not to recede one step from that conscientious assertion of scriptural principle in all its fulness, which has placed the question upon its present solid basis; and which has gained the confidence of the faithful servants of Christ, and produced a powerful effect upon the nation at large. Even should nothing ever be legislatively effected, the gain will still have been great, both positively and negatively. We say positively, for much has been done in private life and in various public institutions, in consequence of the exertions made by Sir A. Agnew, and the Lord's Day Society and its friends. Scarcely a month elapses without some testimony of this kind; thus the legislative council of the Cape of Good Hope has just passed an Act for the better observance of the Lord's Day; the court of common council of London has rescinded a resolution of more than fifty years' standing, by which the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs are to entertain the judges on the first Sunday in term, "according to ancient custom;" and a society has been instituted, which we trust will meet with ample aid and success, for abolishing the great sin and evil of Sunday wakes; an old relic of popery, condemned by all true protestants, though encouraged by Archbishop Laud and divines of his school. But negatively these zealous and conscientious efforts have done still more good, by preventing new violations of the Sabbath; for we believe, that but for them there would have been great danger of various places of secular resort being thrown open upon the Sunday, and we are not sure that the opening of some of the theatres would not have been attempted.

But while we would urge that there should be no retrocession from the scriptural principle, we are far from saying that it would be unlawful to accept any instalment of the full measure of good which is to be wished for and striven for. We should be glad to shut up shops and public houses, to prohibit rail-road travelling, and many other things; and if measures are good in themselves, and involve no sacrifice of principle, we do not think we ought to reject them, because we cannot obtain all that was proposed in Sir A. Agnew's comprehensive Bill.

The parliamentary recess is to be abridged to the 16th of January, in consequence of the revolt in Lower Canada, which, unless promptly suppressed, threatens to rob our gracious queen of a bright jewel of her diadem. It were too long a history to trace the frequent mismanagement of that colony; but one of the worst features has been that of truckling to disloyalty and popery, which, in their fostered power, now threaten all that is British and Protestant with extermination. The spiritual wants of the people have been grievously neglected, and even the grants for the support of protestant missionaries have been reduced and withdrawn; so that as a nation we have been contented to leave our fellow subjects, as sheep without a shepherd. These proceedings have assuredly been impolitic as well as irreligious; as indeed everything that is unscriptural is essentially impolitic. What will be the result, it is not for us to attempt to predict. The last accounts, while we are writing, afford hope that the insurrection may be timely quelled; but without much skill and firmness combined with great forbearance upon the part of those who direct her Majes-

ty's counsels, the British party, who have a just right to expect to be protected, must eventually succumb to the revolters, that is, to the hydra of French revolutionary principles and the sorceries of popery, both abetted by some of the members of the British senate, particularly Mr. Leader and Mr. Hume, who have expressed their exultation at the revolt." Lower Canada is but transatlantic Ireland; and M. Papineau was not likely, any more than Mr. O'Connell, "to try the experiment" of union one moment longer than he should find a temporising policy necessary to effect his avowed ultimate design of separation. Lord John Russell proposes declaring Martial Law in the colony,—a severe expedient, but which, if promptly and effectually applied for the suppression of tumult, may prevent a civil war, and all its sanguinary horrors.

The troubles in this north-west colony remind us of a scheme which is in agitation for founding a British settlement in the far off South-east, upon the shores of New Zealand. In consequence of a report that her majesty's government had promised a charter to an association for that purpose, there was some conversation upon the subject in parliament; and Sir R. H. Inglis strongly urged upon government not to take that step till the matter has been fully investigated by parliament. The affairs of the conquered colony of Canada at this moment shew that England will do well not to be too hasty in playing at colony-making; but the proposed settlement in New Zealand is fraught with peculiar evils; for it is not intended to be a mere holding of grants or purchases of lands, but a subjection of a portion of New Zealand to the British crown, the local administration being in the hands of a chartered company. We recommend our readers to peruse a most able pamphlet on the subject, just published by Mr. Coates, the intelligent and indefatigable lay secretary of the Church Missionary Society. We had occasion lately, in reviewing the Evidence before the House of Commons' Aborigines Committee, to quote largely from Mr. Coates's testimony as to the efficacy of the Gospel in civilizing savages; of which the labours of the Church Missionary Society in New Zealand afford one of the most striking instances upon record. We can well imagine that as a secretary of that admirable institution, Mr. Coates would be peculiarly sensitive as to whatever might by possibility impede the blessed effects of the pious labours of his own and kindred Societies which God has so manifestly prospered; and we allowed for this in sifting his arguments; for if upon the whole New Zealand were benefited; if civilization, and Christianity, and the happiness of the natives would flourish more under the auspices of a powerful white colony than through missionary labours, we should not be jealous—nor, we are sure, would any member or officer of the Church Missionary Society—as to the instrumentality by which, through God's blessing, the good was effected.

But it is due to Mr. Coates to say that his arguments appear to us irresistible. There are few topics upon which we have ourselves written more earnestly during many years than the wrongs of the aborigines in the vicinity of European colonies; and all that Mr. Coates so humanely, so philosophically, so historically advances upon this subject, has found a response in our deepest sympathies. We feel assured, from all past fact, and from all probable reasonings, that if the proposed colony is formed in New Zealand, European encroachment will soon begin to press hard upon the natives, who, after a course of injustice and oppression, will gradually retreat before the march of the powerful invader, and at length become exterminated; so that the dried head of a New Zealander will in a few ages be as much a curiosity as the foot of the Dodo, or the stuffed skin of the apterix, to prove that such a race once existed. Some infidel physiologists have accounted for the melting away of savages before civilized intruders, upon the principle of inferior races yielding to superior; and have told us, that however much philanthropy may mourn over it, the "dark varieties of man" have not the high cerebral configuration of the Caucasian standard, which includes all the white nations, and are therefore destined to give way before them, as monkeys and lions are driven out before Hottentots and Caffers; and that, upon the whole, good comes of it, as "a more noble animal" is thus substituted. Philosophists who thus argue may enjoy their argument for any refutation that we shall honour it with; but to those who believe that Negroes, North American Indians, Otaheiteans, New Zealanders, and all the dark not less than the light "varieties of man," have souls as well as bodies; that they were created by one common Father with ourselves, and redeemed by the same blood, and need to be regenerated by the same Spirit, it is enough to say that a nation of civilized Christian New Zealanders, "clothed and in their right mind," would be a blessed spectacle, which ought not to be prevented by the encroaching incursions of European domination.

For the details of Mr. Coates's objections we must for the present refer

our readers to his pamphlet, in which he shows, by historical facts, that European colonization has always produced the evils which we have described; that there is nothing to prevent a similar result in New Zealand; that the sovereignty of tracts of land cannot be obtained except by force and bloodshed; that wrongs, aggressions, and warfare, must inevitably occur; that the peaceable labours of missionary institutions will be thwarted, and their agents exposed to the vengeance of the incensed natives; and that there will be an end at once to the auspicious hope of seeing a people pass from a savage to a civilized and Christian state, through the agency of Europeans, with the complete preservation of the aboriginal race, and of their national independence. How must every Christian rejoice to see a flourishing branch of the church which his Divine Lord purchased for his inheritance, springing up amidst the rocks and valleys of New Zealand! And is the blessed hope of this to be sacrificed for the establishment of a colony under the government of Mr. E. G. Wakefield?

We had prepared some lengthened remarks upon the proposed plan of national education; the revision of the statutes of our Universities; the British encouragement of Idolatry in India; and other subjects; but we have not space for them at present, though we have exceeded our regular limits.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

T. T.; A PROTESTANT CLERGYMAN; AN AGED OBSERVER; W. E.; A CONSTANT READER; E. W.; E. D.; MELANCTHON; B. B.; PRESBYTER; T. W. S.; A CLERGYMAN; AN OBSERVER; CLERICUS; G. D.; W. W.; W. S.; A. E. P.: ZENAS; M. F.; H. G.; A DISSENTER; are under consideration.

W. E. and A CONGREGATIONALIST, who address us on the Hewley trusts, will perceive that we have inserted a letter from the Rev. J. P. Smith on the subject. Dr. Smith has sent us his Chancery Evidence, which corresponds with his summary of it in his paper; but of this we made no question; we only wondered, and still wonder, at Congregationalists assuming to be Presbyterians.

We fear that DELTA's inquiry as to the nature of "the resurrection body of Christ," would not lead to much information or profit.

A gentleman in the War Office obligingly informs us that it appears by the documents in that office, that Silas Tomken Comberbatch (Samuel Taylor Coleridge) enlisted in the 15th dragoons at Reading, Dec. 3, 1793, and was discharged at Hounslow, April 10, 1794. These dates throw some light upon the particulars of his history alluded to at page 597 of our last volume. Mr. Bowles has said, that "The most correct, sublime, and beautiful of Mr. Coleridge's poems—the Religious Musings—was written, *non inter sylvas academi*, but in the tap-room at Reading." Mr. Cottle replied that there is a memorandum on the original manuscript, which says that it was written "on Christmas Eve, 1794" (we suppose not Christmas Eve, but the evening of Christmas-day), and the printed poem has the same date. The war-office dates, therefore, shew that Mr. Bowles is at least verbally incorrect; but considering that the poem is very elaborate, and contains more than four hundred lines, it could not have been written in one evening; and very probably many of the "Musings" were conceived at Reading, though they were not finally committed to paper and perfected till the end of the year. Many of the passages might have been aptly written amidst the scenes of vice and wretchedness which he probably witnessed while billeted among soldiers at an ale-house. The allusion to recruits "forced or enshared to glory's field," and many others, were probably characteristic.

The Rev. Dr. Pusey having published a statement in the British Magazine, that the Rev. G. Townsend, of Durham, was convinced by Dr. Pusey's explanations, that he had been "misled" by a "pamphlet published at Oxford, the Christian Observer, and private information," respecting some ecclesiastical innovations at Oxford, we wrote to Mr. Townsend, to the effect that we were quite sure he meant nothing unjust, unkind, or uncandid towards us, but that we were pained at seeing in print a charge that we had "misled" him, without reference to any one fact or passage in proof that we had done so; and we requested him to favour us with mentioning in what particulars he considered we had made an incorrect statement; we were not aware of any

incorrectness, nor had Dr. Pusey proved any; but that if any were pointed out, we should be glad to amend it. Dr. Pusey's letter, indeed, confirms, instead of disproving, our statements; but we will not now anticipate the remarks which we propose offering upon that matter in our next Number.

We have received from Mr. Townsend, in reply to our communication, a very obliging letter, in which he says, "You do but speak the truth, when you express your conviction that I would not say or do any thing unjust, uncandid, or unkind. When I said to Dr. Pusey that I had been misled by Mr. Maurice's pamphlet and by the Christian Observer, I meant, that the impression produced on my mind, by reading the allusions which are severally made in these publications to the revival of certain ceremonies which have now become obsolete, was, that such revival was much more extensive, than upon strict examination it has proved to be. You wish me to refer you to the passages which I may have deemed to be erroneous. I cannot mention one. The particular sentence, however, which I may say misled me, is to be found in the Number for June last, (page 397,) towards the end. It occurs among the very admirable remarks which you have there made, in continuation from some preceding Numbers on the Oxford Tracts. The words in question are—'We have heard that certain of the Oxford Tract Divines are trying to bring back their flocks to some of the old superstitious vanities in this matter.' I interpreted this sentence to denote, that many clergymen, not one or two only, influenced by Mr. Newman and Dr. 'Pusey, had acted in the manner to which you there allude, and which I believed there was reason to condemn. I trust that this explanation will prove satisfactory. You are at liberty to make what use of it you please, and shew that it either does or does not in your opinion justify my remark in my letter to Dr. Pusey."—It appears from Mr. Townsend's candid and obliging explanation, that the only particular in which he meant that we misled him, was as to the extent of the proceedings in question. Now we said nothing as to the extent; and the measured words, "certain of the Oxford Tract Divines," would be strictly correct, even if the evil were limited to Dr. Pusey's own admissions. But our reverend correspondent will perceive that Dr. Pusey's extenuation refers exclusively to the locality of Oxford; whereas our statement was not "the Oxford Divines" but "the Oxford Tract Divines"; meaning not merely those locally ministering in Oxford, but their colleagues and pupils, who, during the last two or three years, have been endeavouring to disseminate their opinions in other dioceses. Mr. Keble himself is not parochially an Oxford Divine, and therefore not included in Dr. Pusey's catalogue; but he is an Oxford Tract divine, though officiating in a southern county; and there are others in various parts of the kingdom. But in point of principle, if but one clergyman, says Mr. Newman, in a public station, in the academical church of St. Mary's, Oxford, has introduced, and continues, and vindicates such proceedings, unchecked by official authority, it would be necessary to remonstrate, lest the evil should spread; being carried from the fountain head at Oxford by the young divines who radiate thence to all parts of the kingdom. There remains no point of discussion between us and Mr. Townsend; but Dr. Pusey's letter must not pass unnoticed.

We are deeply indebted to a very large number of friends and correspondents, who have written to us in terms of much kindness upon the commencement of our new series. We thank them heartily for the warm interest which they are pleased to take in the success of the Christian Observer, and for their promises to use their best efforts to extend its circulation, and as they are pleased to say, its usefulness. We, however, respectfully remind them, that unless they see that their friendly wishes take the practical shape of booksellers' orders, their intentions will not be effected. We would suggest to some of our book-club readers to consider whether they could not commence taking in the New Series for themselves and their families, instead of allowing our numbers only a hasty visit at their fireside, as they whirl through the club. Most of the complaints against long and elaborate articles come from three-day book-society readers; whereas those papers are often considered the most valuable and interesting, where the reader has the month before him to peruse them at his leisure.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 2. FEBRUARY. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ON INCONSIDERATION (ST. JAMES iv. 13, 14, 15).

For the Christian Observer.

AS the close of a year calls us to look back upon the past of life, the commencement of a year calls us to look onward to its future. At the beginning of a year we should, as it were, rise from that profound humiliation in which penitential sorrow prostrated us before God, when we reviewed our sins and failings at the close of the past year; and we should rise, to run with patience the race which the coming year sets before us; and with renewed resolutions of devoting ourselves without compromise to God. We should review the *experience* of the past year—the circumstances, the feelings, the conduct, to which it gave birth—in order that we may collect from it materials on which to form our resolutions for the future. We should examine what sins we have committed, in deed, word, or thought, and especially what sins did most easily beset us, that we may guard in a peculiar manner against them. We should consider what duties we have omitted, or performed slightly and inadequately, whether to ourselves, our neighbour, or to God; and we should note down these for frequent and especial remembrance. We should inquire what society, or business, or amusement; what persons, places, or practices, have betrayed us into sin, or prevented us from walking as closely and as comfortably with God as we should otherwise have done; and though any of these were dear as a right eye or a right hand, we should cut it off and cast it from us. We should review the *dispensations of Providence*. If affliction has been our lot, we should remember that God does not grieve or afflict willingly the children of men, and that it is only if needs be his children are in heaviness through manifold temptations. We should then see the rod, and Him who appointed it. We should ask him, not with murmuring and discontent, but with holy determination, Wherefore hast thou thus contended with me? We should not cease to plead and search until we have discovered the accursed thing, and we should then form our resolutions of amendment in this particular; and, by permitting this chastening to produce in us the peaceable fruits of righteousness, seek to cut off the entail of offence and suffering. If prosperity, in whatever degree, has been our portion, we should review it with thankfulness, and as an additional obligation and encouragement to devote

ourselves anew to the service of so gracious a Master. And if, on a calm review of the past year, we find it, as assuredly most persons will find it, a chequered scene of joys and sorrows; if our song must often be of judgment as well as of mercy; and if, with many comforts—more than we deserved, or perhaps desired—there is much that was sorrowful and depressing; if many sanguine expectations with which we commenced the year have been utterly disappointed, many important plans confounded, many ardent hopes deferred; if affliction has visited us in our families, our property, our health, our character; if many friends have been removed from our society, or torn from the still closer and fonder embraces of our bleeding hearts;—oh! let not this lesson which sad experience has taught be lost: let us enter upon another year with views more sober; let us learn to moderate our expectations from the things of time, as brief and uncertain in their continuance, and even while they do last imperfect and unsatisfying; and let us especially keep in mind that every creature comfort, that every channel through which enjoyment is derived to man, as well as all that enjoyment which flows through it, is not to be attained by human prudence or human power, but is the free gift, and in the sole and absolute disposal, of an overruling Providence.

Such is a general outline of the views and feelings with which we should enter upon another year; and such the Apostle suggests in the passage before us. In it he addresses the careless and worldly-minded, self-confident and rejoicing in their own boastings, and forgetful of God. "Go to, now, ye that say, To-day or to-morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away. For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that."

"Go to" is an old English phrase which, though now obsolete, was in common use when the Scriptures were first translated. The original word is a call to serious consideration, somewhat in the spirit of God's call by the prophet, "Come now and let us reason together." And well might the Apostle call to serious consideration, when he was about to propose to the worldly mind the uncertain and transitory character of life and of the things of time; for there is no greater obstacle against which religion has to contend—no, not even men's tempers, appetites, and passions—than that thoughtlessness and inconsideration with which they meet its most solemn appeals, and behind which they shield themselves from the impression which its momentous truths and affecting providences must otherwise necessarily make upon their minds. All the unnecessary business, all the idle amusements and boisterous sports, which do not minister even to sensual gratification, are employed by Satan for the sole purpose of producing this. They are so many toys with which he fills up the intervals and vacancies of necessary business, and pre-occupies the mind so as effectually to exclude a thought of God and eternity, of death and judgment, of heaven and hell. Thus the "strong man armed keepeth his palace, and his goods are in peace." He well knows that if the unconverted mind were suffered to fall back upon itself, and to feel the famine of that land, war would immediately be kindled; and that he must fight for the possession of his throne in the sinner's heart, a difficult and doubtful battle upon the field of

conscience. His object therefore is to blind the eyes of them that believe not; to keep them earthly-minded and sensual; to amuse them with pleasures; to absorb them in business and cares; to make them worshippers of that world of which he is himself "the prince" and "the god;" and as to all practical purposes—and as to all real knowledge of the one living and true God—atheists.

And is this too heavy a charge to bring against men in general? Let your own conscience answer. I do not, nor does the Apostle, speak to the profligate and debauched sensualist; to the unhappy creature who is serving divers lusts and passions, living in gross and unblushing sin. But it speaks to the decent, the respectable, and the honourable; it speaks to the wise and prudent man of the world, who is diligently pursuing his worldly calling, whatever that calling may be, with a single eye to "get gain," and to maintain withal a good character among men. Nor do I, nor does the Apostle, accuse this man of artifice and dishonesty; of defrauding his neighbour in the intercourse of business;—but he is accused of robbing God of his glory; of defrauding God of the acknowledgments due to his providence; of never saying in his inmost soul, 'Thou, God, seest me!' but of living as if there were no God; of forming his plans and proceeding to execute them, as if life, health, and prosperity were at his own disposal, and not at God's.

Nor suffer yourself to be deluded by that most common and most dangerous error, that religion is, as it were, a current, which flows perfectly apart and separate from the ordinary current of life; that it is a business to be transacted in the Lord's house, and on the Lord's day, just as the merchant's business is to be transacted in his counting-house, and the trader's in his shop, and the farmer's in his fields, and there only, and at certain stated times. No. This is essential superstition. Until men see that religion should pervade every act, and accompany them into every society; that it belongs just as much to the merchant's office, and the trader's shop, as to the closet or the Lord's table; that whether they eat, or drink, or whatever they do, they may, and should do all to the glory of God; they see not what religion really is: they forget that the same God who says that where two or three are gathered together in His name, there He is in the midst of them, says also, that He is about our bed, and about our path, and spieth out all our ways; that we live, and move, and have our being in the centre of His omnipresence, the strong grasp of His omnipotence, the full and piercing and all revealing light of His omniscience; this they totally and willingly forget; and yet it is just in proportion as we remember this—just in proportion as we realize a sense of the continual presence of God—that we are Christians.

The Apostle speaks to those who say, "To-day or to-morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy, and sell, and get gain." Does he, reader, speak to you? Have you any plans or projects for "to-day, or to-morrow;" for the present year; for even a still more distant period? And have you formed them without a deep sense of the uncertainty of life, and of your best concerted plans; and without a distinct reference and an implicit submission of yourself and them to the will of an overruling Providence? Has the spirit of your plan been, "If the Lord will I shall live, and do this or that?" Oh remember that you know not what a day may bring forth: you know not whether the decree has not already gone forth, "This

night thy soul shall be required of thee." For what is your life? It is even "a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away."

But even though the present year be granted you, how many obstacles may Providence interpose between you and the entering upon your best concerted plans! And even though the field of action be fully opened to you,—though you be permitted to enter upon your plan, and this too under the most favourable auspices,—though life, health, and strength, be spared you for the year, to prosecute it with vigour,—what security have you that its issue shall be successful? Though you may live, and be permitted to "buy and sell," what security have you that you shall "get gain?" How often do we see wise men and prudent plans, we know not why, or sometimes how, fail! How often do we see men enter upon some speculation in business with skill, prudence, credit, capital; in fact with every thing which, according to human measures, should ensure success; and yet through unforeseen and unavoidable casualties, through the connections of business in which they are necessarily entangled with others, or through some withering though undiscernable blight upon their efforts, they fail and come to ruin; while others, far their inferiors in every advantage, succeed in a similar undertaking, and realize large fortunes? When a man leaves his house, perhaps merely for the purpose of taking exercise, and scarcely thinks or cares to what direction he turns, he may thus casually, as it is termed, meet some individual who will make or mar his fortune: he may meet or escape from some accident which would be attended with loss of limb or life. I remember a circumstance which occurred in my early years, and made at the time a strong impression upon my mind. During a night of violent storm, the roof of a solitary house in Limerick, which stood in an exposed situation on one of the quays of the Shannon, was blown in, and carried the floors with it to the ground. In the wild morning which succeeded that tempestuous night, when persons collected to see the ruin, the master of the house was discovered standing undressed in one of the upper windows, much alarmed no doubt, but perfectly safe and unhurt. The account which he gave was this. Being prevented from sleeping by the violence of the storm, and it being a moonlight night, he arose when the tempest was at its height, to look out upon the agitation of the waters, and had scarcely reached the window when the roof sank, and swept away the floor upon which he had been but a moment before standing. Every body said, What a wonderful interposition of Providence! It is true that there was a *manifest* interposition of Providence. But is it not our want of faith which prevents us from seeing equally the hand of God in every occurrence of life? Could men think and speak thus, who really believed that not a sparrow falleth to the ground without our Father, and that the very hairs of their head are all numbered? We at once acknowledge a particular Providence in the influence upon this person's mind, which led him, perhaps the only one of the numerous inhabitants of that large city, to rise from his bed during such an uninviting and tempestuous night, and to proceed to his window at that precise and critical moment. But would not faith shew us equally the hand of a particular Providence ordering every trivial circumstance—trivial, as we are apt to call them in our ignorance of their bearing and consequences—in the history of his past life; each of which, let it be re-

membered, conspired, and was necessary, as a link in the chain, to fix *him*, rather than any other of these numerous inhabitants, in this particular house, and at that particular time; and thus to place him, in the first instance, within the jaws of this danger, from which it afterwards graciously interposed to deliver him. Every man, if he wanted such evidence to convince him that it is not his own wisdom or his own will which shapes his destiny, might trace back the most important events of his life to some circumstance equally trivial as that which directly led this person to his window. And who, I ask, orders and regulates these trivial circumstances—those hinges upon which the destinies of life turn, and in which man's reason and will are in abeyance? The infidel world, in its ignorance of God, answers, Chance. But who or what is chance? Where does it dwell? and whence has it derived its power of swaying the destinies of the universe? Chance, the Christian knows, is but an empty sound with which the atheist veils his ignorance of God. Chance is but the unmeaning name which those who know not God give to providence.

This practical atheism is man's damning sin. As it respects God, it robs him of his glory: it refuses to receive prosperity as God's gift, and to repay the debt of thankfulness: it refuses to acknowledge adversity as God's chastening rod, and to bow in penitence and humiliation. It is an attempt to dethrone God, and to banish Him out of his own world! It practically says, We will not have this man to reign over us. Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. It is more—it is an attempt at extinguishing His very existence: with the fool it says in heart, No God! And as it respects man himself, it is the very root and fountain of all his sin, which, with this, would wither and dry up. And it is well worthy of observation, in this view, that when our Lord would describe the state of the antediluvian world, and of Sodom and Gomorrah, he does not enumerate any one of those many and heinous crimes of which we know that they were guilty, but condenses all into their root and principle—love of the world, and forgetfulness of God. "They ate and drank, bought and sold, planted and builded, married and were given in marriage—and *considered not*."

And, as Inconsideration is the fruitful source of sin, it is also the most effectual bar to reformation. "Walk before me, and be thou perfect," is the rule and mean of perfection which God himself prescribed to the Patriarch; and even though this high authority had not thus expressly declared it, we might reasonably suppose, that no principle could be found more operative upon man, more sanctifying, and more effectual in transforming him into the Divine image, than an habitual sense of the presence and heart-inspection of a holy God. Under the felt glance of such an eye, every root of sin would wither, and every bud of holiness would ripen and expand.

And is Inconsideration less folly and misery than it is sin, in a world such as this?—a world where all is in constant fluctuation, and where our most cherished enjoyments are momentarily at the risk of a thousand vicissitudes, from a thousand causes, which no wisdom could foresee, and consequently over which we can exercise no controul? Where riches make themselves wings and flee away; where death invades the sanctuary of home, and tears from us the desire of our eyes, the child of our affection, the friend that sticketh closer than a brother; where pain and disease attack the bodily frame, and langour

depresses the spirits, and days of gloom and wearisome nights are appointed us; who, but God, can stay and support the doubting, trembling bosom? Who, but God, can tranquillize the heavings of the troubled breast? Who, but God, can pour balm into the wounded spirit and the bleeding heart? Would not the world, at such seasons, be intolerable, but for the thought that all our concerns are under the management and protection of an all-powerful, all-wise, and loving Friend; that every suffering we endure is the prescription of a kind and skilful Physician; that, beyond the limits which He defines, no created power can touch to harm us; and that all we can suffer, within those limits, is designed for, and shall be converted into, our good; that, amid the contentions of men, God is our shield; that, amid all the trials of life and prospects of death, He graciously proposes himself as our exceeding great reward; that all things are ours, for that all shall work together for our everlasting good.

If you ask for some general principle, which, as a pervading spirit, should animate and direct you, I answer, Live, as if this year were to be, what it *will* to many, and *may* to you—your last. These lines may perhaps be read aloud in some family circle. Suppose then (to borrow Massilon's impressive thought), an angelic messenger, sent down from heaven, were suddenly to appear in the midst of that circle, and to announce, by Divine commission, that one of its members should pass into eternity on that day in the following year. How appalling to some, how solemn to all, would be such an announcement; and in proportion as each believed that it spake of *him*, how influential would it become upon his character and conduct! But suppose this messenger from heaven were to point to an individual, and to say, Thou art the man! and to produce his high credentials, and to cite him by name to appear on that day twelve-months before the bar of God; would not all agree that this individual should raise his affections from earth to heaven; that he should devote himself to spiritual contemplation and prayer; and that he should mingle himself in the affairs of this life only so far as duty called, or as a provision for the necessary wants and moderate comforts of his limited span of life required? But, in awful contrast with this, is it not revolting to see, as we too often do at our watering places, where the votaries of pleasure and of health, the dissipated and the dying, flock together in most unnatural union, as if pleasure would stimulate her languid pursuers by a clear view of the brevity of life, and pointing to some living skeleton would say, "Carpe diem," "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" is it not, I say, shocking to see, in those whited sepulchres, persons of whom I have myself heard their physician say—and say what the event proved to be truth—That man cannot live to see another year! to see such with only a portion of a year between them, and death and judgment, heaven or hell, plunged in the debaucheries, absorbed by the cares and business, or fluttering amid the gaieties, of the world? All agree that such a man should earnestly seek to be at peace with an offended God, and to cultivate those tastes and tempers which would render him meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light. And if you admit that such should be the conduct of him who was assured of life for an entire year by a voice from heaven, what should be *your* conduct, who know not what a day may bring forth, or what may be on the morrow? What is *your* security that you shall live another year—that you shall

see this day twelvemonths? May not this night your soul be required of you? For what is your life? It is, in the emphatic language of the Apostle, "a vapour, which appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away."

The Apostle here compares life to one of those luminous vapours, exhaled from earth, or generated in the higher atmosphere; bright but unsubstantial; whose flame is fed from its own vitals, and which, from the moment it has kindled into existence, is consuming its own being. And is such the life of man? And is there no exception of the wise, the mighty, the noble? Is the profound philosopher, the able statesman, the far famed and widely devastating conqueror, to be thus levelled with the mean, the ignorant, the ignoble? Yes, Death is the grand leveller of ranks and fortunes:

> Pallida mors æquo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas,
> Regumque turres.

Or, if there must be a distinction marked, it is the same as subsists between the coarse vapour lighted up amid the morasses of the moor or mountain, and which can meet the straying gaze, or seduce into destruction the unwary steps, but of some solitary, benighted peasant; and the falling star, which shoots rapidly through higher air, and catches the sudden glance, and arrests the steps, of admiring multitudes; more brilliant indeed and beautiful, but still more short-lived and evanescent. If all flesh is as grass, all the glory of man is as the flower of grass; more delicate indeed, but more frail; more beautiful but more transitory: youth, strength, beauty, intellect, sensibility, vigour of body and of mind; in fact all those qualities which elevate, and ennoble, and distinguish man from his fellow, quickly fade and perish, and leave the body which they once ornamented, and rendered the admiration or the envy of thousands, but a blasted, withered trunk, a gloomy monument of the vanity and misery of man.

Devotedness to the world, and indifference to God, are the full amount of the charge which the Apostle brings. And assuredly indifference to that Being upon whose power and sufferance we depend for every breath we breathe, and whose bounty gives us all things richly to enjoy, were sufficient folly and sufficient ingratitude. And yet there is a deeper shade of criminality than this. Even this atheism of indifference is a lower grade in the scale of guilt, and the calendar of damnation, than gross, and wilful, and unblushing sin. Is there any reader of these lines who lives in habits of known sin, and who now forms no resolution to cast them off?—nay, who resolves that he will still continue in them? Is there any who is linked with others in bonds of iniquity which he is determined that he will not burst? Oh consider, I beseech you, what you do, and what the language of such a life is. I speak not now of the tremendous ruin which you are drawing down upon your own devoted soul. I speak not of the endless miseries into which you are plunging with you the partners of your crime, and the victims of your example. I speak not now of any *consequences* of your sin. But I ask, What is the voice with which thine own and thy brother's blood crieth unto God? You acknowledge that you live but by the sufferance and on the bounties of God; and if you are determined to commit "this or that" sin, what, I ask, in your lips would be the blasphemy of that expression which the Apostle would put into the lips and life of every Christian: "If the

Lord will I shall live, and do this or that."* That is; if God continue to me, for the coming year, life, and health, and strength, all of which I admit He can in a moment withdraw; if his guardian care preserve me from accident and adversity, from the bed of pain and sickness; if his bounty bestow upon me liberty, competence, honour, and acceptance in the eyes of man; I will prostitute these, his gifts, to my own and his dishonour; I will pour contempt upon his authority, and trample upon His laws; I will convert his blessings into instruments of rebellion against Him; they shall supply the scourge, and the nails, and the spear, and the thorns, and the cross, with which I will crucify unto myself afresh the Son of God, and put him to an open shame. The breath of life which He gives I will send back to heaven, tainted with obscenity, falsehood, imprecations, blasphemies; with all the influence of rank and station to which he may appoint me, I will frown into contempt His doctrines and disciples: my talents and learning shall silence many an humble advocate of His cause, and confirm many a timid and wavering sinner: the vigour of health I will prostitute to impurity and uncleanness: the sound mind and sound body, God's best temporal blessings, I will steep in intoxication, and embrute in sensuality: the endowments of nature, and accomplishments of education, grace of person, or of address, I will employ to seduce the innocent, and betray the unsuspecting: with that wealth which God has given me, I will purchase their bodies for my sins, and their souls for Satan? Thus, with unholy hand, I will scatter pollution and misery around me. O pray not that God may continue your life for such purposes. If you have made a covenant with sin which you are determined that you will not break, pray that God may at this moment, in awful mercy, cast you quick into hell, rather than suffer you to live that you may thus abuse His mercies, and treasure up for yourself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.

The uncertainty of life is indeed an unanswerable argument for watchfulness and habitual preparation. But is it not a mistake to imagine that the motives, even in the way of terror, for dedicating yourself, body, soul, and spirit, without compromise, to God, would be less cogent, if you were assured that you should live not only this but many future years, than if you were assured that this year should be your last? Remember that those years, though quickly past, and then forgotten by us as though they had never been, are imperishably ever present with God; that their record is on high; that their every deed, and word, and thought, though long faded from our memory, is indelibly registered in the book of God's remembrance, amid the archives of eternity; and that sins committed, and duties neglected, and opportunities unimproved, and grace resisted, and conscience overborne and silenced, will rise up against us in the judgment, and condemn us. Let us then so live this, and every year to come, as that when we stand before the bar of God we shall not have cause to regret that those years were added to us, and to wish that we had been cut short, even in the midst of our sins, and cast quick into

* For this impressive thought, as well as for many others, with a more particular reference to which I have thought it unnecessary to trouble either the printer or reader of a periodical, I acknowledge my obligations to the Rev. Henry Woodward.

hell, in the morning of our days, than spared to add the sins and negligence of another year to the damning calendar of our crimes, and thus to heap more fuel upon the pile of our own everlasting burnings. Let us so live this year as our reason and our conscience tell us we should wish that we had lived, were we lying upon the bed of death, or standing before the bar of judgment. Let us accept the pardon dearly purchased by the sufferings and death of Christ, and freely offered to the guilty and the lost, and let us be reconciled to God. Let us ask, and receive, that Spirit of holiness which can sanctify the soul, and assimilate us to the Divine image. Let us seek habitually to realise, by faith, and by devout meditation, the Divine presence, and God will come to us, and make His abode with us. If we live throughout the year, we shall live holy and happy. If before its close we pass through the dark valley of the shadow of death, we shall be more than conquerors, through Him that loveth us. J. M. H.

ON THE CONVERSION OF DR. JOHNSON.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE following passage, extracted from "Addresses to the Deity," by Dr. James Fordyce, 12mo., 1785, may perhaps serve as a supplement to the evidence which has already appeared in your work on the conversion of Dr. Johnson. After noticing the obligations of the public for the example which Dr. Johnson had so long exhibited of superior wisdom, correct morals, and profound learning, Dr. Fordyce adds:—"But what is man, O Lord! or who among the sons of men can plead innocence before the thrice Holy? When trouble and anguish came upon thy aged servant; when 'his sleep went from him;' when, in solemn recollection, he 'communed with his own heart, upon his bed,' and examined himself in the view of his last and great account, he saw wherein he had offended. Then it was that *I heard him* condemn, with holy self-abasement, the pride of understanding by which he had often trespassed against the laws of courteous demeanour, and forgotten the fallible condition of his nature. How deep was the contrition which then penetrated his soul, in the remembrance of his sins, and caused him to feel more strongly, what indeed he had ever acknowledged, that no extent of intellect, and no eminence of fame, can arm *an awakened* and reflecting mind against the fear of thy displeasure. Let it be known that this man, after considering the uncertainty of life, after studying the sanctity of thy law, after discovering more clearly the utter insufficiency of human attainments, and contemplating with ardent solicitude the stupendous and unspeakable importance of salvation, did—*with all the humility of faith—cast himself on thine infinite mercy through Jesus Christ.*"

Mr. Chalmers has indeed observed, in his Biographical Dictionary, that Dr. Fordyce "made no additions to our stock of theological knowledge." I cannot, however, but think that, as the testimony of an eye-witness, the above observation is not without its value. May I hope that the suggestion given by your correspondent G. C. G., in your last volume, p. 816, as to the expediency of collecting together the very important matter relating to the concluding period of Dr. Johnson's life, which has appeared in the Christian Observer, may receive the attention which it deserves. ZENAS.

ON THE READING OF THE LESSONS BY LAYMEN.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It has happened to me, as a layman, from my early life, to have been occasionally requested by certain of my clerical friends, when visiting at their country cures, to read the Morning and Evening lessons for them, in the public service of the Church. I have always had great gratification in relieving them in this part of their duty, especially when the services and sermons of both parts of the day (to say nothing of the sacrament in addition) have fallen upon the same individual, and I have felt some surprise that the practice of thus partially employing lay readers has not been more general. As it must sometimes happen, that at the close of a laborious week, more especially in cases of weak health, or advancing years, this relief would be very advantageous to many of the Clergy so circumstanced, I can hardly account for the practice being generally, if not exclusively, confined to the country; while in the metropolis, or in other cities and towns, the necessity of such assistance is perhaps still more apparent. Now presuming this custom to be both of ancient origin (as I apprehend it clearly to be) and also unexceptionable in itself, there appears no good reason why it should not be occasionally adopted in all parts of the kingdom; while it seems to be a safe and harmless way of employing the laity, who, (even to take the lowest ground) being thus able to "speak no more than is set down for them," would be employed with perfect safety, having thus nothing left to their own discretion or responsibility.

While the humble instrumentality of the laity would thus become useful in the Church of Christ, I am persuaded that many laymen would feel honoured, in no common degree, by being permitted to convey the word of God to the people.

Thus, at all events, did no less a man than Sir Thomas More feel—and this even while he was the Lord High Chancellor of England. It is stated by his son-in-law, Mr. Roper, that "the Duke of Norfolk coming on a time to Chelsea, to dine with him, fortuned to find him at the church in the quire, with a surplice on his back, singing; to whom, after service, as they went homeward together, arm-in-arm, the Duke said, 'Well, my Lord Chancellor, a Parish Clerk! — a Parish Clerk! You dishonour the King, and his office.' 'Nay,' quoth Sir Thomas More, smiling on the Duke, 'your Grace may not think that the King, your master and mine, will be offended with me for serving of God his Master, or thereby account his office dishonoured.'" This story is repeated by his great-grandson, Mr. More, adding that "he wore a surplice, and sung with the singers at the high mass and matins in his parish church;" altering also a little the Chancellor's answer, which he puts in this form, "Your Grace may not think I dishonour my Prince, in my dutifulness to his Lord, and ours; having in his mind that saying of David, in the like case, dancing before the ark of God, girded with a linen ephod, when his wife Michal laughed at him, 'Vilior fiam in oculis meis.' He often, also, walked in public processions, carrying the cross before the rest, *thinking himself happy if he could any way shew love and readiness in God's service.*" Weaver, also, in his Funeral Monuments, says, "He was wonderfully zealous in religion, and devout,

insomuch that divers times in his chancellorship, he would put on a surplice, and help the priest to *say*, and sing, Divine service."

There can be little doubt, that so far as the Romish Breviary allowed the use of the Lessons, Sir Thomas More would have read them, in common with the other parts of the service; but unhappily, in that darker age, from which it is the glory of the Reformation to have delivered us, the portion of Holy Scripture which could be obtained in public was small indeed, for, as our Church truly observes, "The godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers [in reading the Holy Scriptures daily in the church] had been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories and legends, with multitudes of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals, that when any book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read all the rest were unread." But besides all this, we are equally sure, from the same authority, that whether priest or layman was the reader, the congregation could be little the better for it; for it is complained by the reformers of the old, and the compilers of the present, Liturgy, that "the service of the Church of England, these many years, hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understand not, so that they have heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind have not been edified thereby."—(See the beautiful Prefix to the Liturgy, entitled "Concerning the Service of the Church.")

There can be no doubt, that the ancient usage of our Church, in respect of the lay-reading of the Scriptures, was derived from the custom which prevailed before the Reformation, and which we find Sir Thomas More considered it a privilege to observe. A similar practice has since obtained in all cathedral and collegiate churches (though somewhat less, perhaps, of late years), and this even in the presence of the head of the Church; as at Windsor, in particular, where many now living have witnessed a lay clerk invariably reading the first lesson. The usage of lay-reading prevailed throughout both the dioceses of Winchester and Salisbury; and the parish clerk of Basingstoke, as also in the largest church of Salisbury, invariably read the lessons within my own recollection; as many (perhaps most) parish clerks do, to this day, through the county of Devon generally. We also know this to be the constant practice in all college chapels, to this hour; and very gratifying has it been to me, as a father, to attend, occasionally, at the early prayers, where the young probationers for the sacred ministry have been thus permitted to qualify themselves for part of their future work; while others, who were destined for a very different walk in life, have perhaps thus first acquired a reverence for the word of God which they have ever afterwards retained.

So much for the *saying* of the service by the laity, as it is called by Weaver; and with regard to the *singing* of that service, it is probably forgotten by those who would give up the chanting by the minor canons in our cathedral churches, that, in that case, a great part of the service is wholly performed by laymen, as "the Psalms," "the Te Deum," &c., &c. We know that Readers were an order in the primitive Church; and that in the Church of Alexandria, catechumens were expressly allowed to read the Holy Scriptures, and therefore, *à fortiori*, confirmed christians (although of the laity) might certainly do so.

It is indeed somewhat remarkable that (so far as I discover) the canons of the Church of England are silent upon the practice of lay-reading; but perhaps the very "silence gives consent;" and it may be observed, in confirmation of that probability, that the direction in the Rubric, concerning the reading of the lessons, does not (as in other cases) enjoin such duty as the peculiar work of "the Minister," but provides as follows—"Then shall *be read* distinctly, with an audible voice, the first lesson, &c. HE THAT READETH, so standing and turning himself as he may best be heard of all such as are present." I find that in the first part of King Edward's Liturgy, printed by Richard Grafton in 1549—a copy of which is in my possession—a direction is inserted, that "to the end the people may the better here, in such places where they do syng, there shall the lessons be songe in a playne tune, after the manner of distinct reading, and lykewise the Epistle and Gospel." — Here therefore the duty of chanting the lessons is no more imposed on the Minister exclusively, than is the duty of reading the lessons; but at all events, I may be permitted to congratulate my brethren of the Reformation on the subsequent change which took place (now about three centuries past) from singing to reading the lessons, and the Epistle and Gospel of the day—no matter whether by the clergy or the laity.

I had expected to find something on this subject either in Wheatley's "Illustration of the Common Prayer," Shepherd's "Critical and Practical Elucidation of the Book of Common Prayer," or Palmer's "Origines Liturgicæ;" but I can save your readers the trouble of a reference; for nothing whatever appears in them, as if leaving the matter to rest upon the ordinary usage of primitive antiquity, and treating it as one which might best and most safely be consigned to the wisdom and discretion of the authorized minister.

It is there that I would most willingly leave it; unless, for the reasons of convenience, if not of necessity, to which I at first adverted, it should appear desirable to the Legislature, or rather to the Episcopal bench (for "tractent fabrilia fabri"), to promulgate any more specific direction, as removing all doubts upon the subject. In the mean time, I conceive it to be quite clear, that in the absence of all express law to the contrary, and with so much argument in favour of lay-reading as is deducible from all antiquity and common sense, (which, as a learned author observes, "is, after all, the best sense, or it would never have been so common,") no alarm or apprehension need be felt by ecclesiastical incumbents, in permitting the discreet and sober exercise of the practice in question, as occasion may appear to render it expedient.

ZENAS.

THE REV. J. CUMMING ON PRESBYTERIANISM AND INDEPENDENCY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

You could not be more surprised, as an Episcopalian, than your Presbyterian brethren of the Church of Scotland are, to find Dr. Pye Smith, and other English Independents or Congregationalists, contending, as their claim to the Lady Hewley property, that they are legitimate Presbyterians. I have no wish to provoke a controversy

upon the points of difference between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, but I could earnestly wish you would allow me to transfer to your pages a few passages from the Rev. J. Cumming's "Apology for the Church of Scotland, in Explanation of its Constitution and Character;" which, having been published without any reference to the question of the Hewley trusts, may be fairly quoted as evidence in the discussion between Dr. Smith and yourself. I have, however, quoted more than is strictly necessary to this precise object, in order that you may perceive the attitude in which moderate and enlightened members of the Church of Scotland, including such men as Dr. Chalmers, Mr. Cumming, and Dr. Gordon, wish to stand towards the Church of England. Some of your readers will perhaps be surprised to find the Church of Scotland so strongly asserting episcopacy and apostolical succession; but all the Protestant churches do so; the difference between them and Episcopalians not being as to the importance of episcopacy and apostolical succession, but as to whether they are perpetuated in a third order, as in your Church, or in the manner described by Mr. Cumming. In the principle the Church of Scotland agrees with you, though not in its application; it also agrees with you as to the duty of providing nationally for the worship of God and the spiritual instruction of the people; and in all these three particulars it differs from Congregationalists and what are called Voluntaries. Mr. Cumming writes as follows:—

"I have undertaken this short explanation of the principles of the Scottish Ecclesiastical Establishment, not in the spirit of controversy, but with a desire to circulate among our brethren of the sister church more correct views of our principles and polity. An age appears to have arrived in which men are shaking off all wholesome restraints, and treating subordination in Church and State as a remnant of papal or feudal despotism. God's ordinance is undervalued, and mere gifts proclaimed as a sufficient substitute. To be able to express oneself with ease and accuracy, and with some popular effect, is thought by thousands to be warrant enough for undertaking the work of the ministry. The authority of the Church is despised; the regular organs of its power set aside; and, instead of that dutiful obedience and sacred esteem of those superior tribunals that have been wisely constituted in the Christian community as the conservators of regularity, decorum, and apostolic authority, there prevails, 'intra muros et extra,' a disregard of every thing save mere personal and popular attainments.

"The following essay is intended to shew that however valuable gifts and graces unquestionably are, the Scottish Church has ever regarded them as utterly insufficient for the ministerial office, unless sealed and sanctioned by competent ecclesiastical authority. It will also enable our southern readers to perceive, that, though in details our Ecclesiastical Establishment differs from theirs, yet in its great principles it is one."

"Our assertion that the government of the Established Church of Scotland is Episcopal will startle not a few of the ministers and members of the sister Church in England. But a little explanation will render our claims to this title just. I do believe that without an episcopacy no one national branch of the catholic church can exist, and no one congregation can put out a claim to be any more than an assembly of Christians. The Church of Scotland repudiates, in the strongest terms, the principles of independency, the system of church government adopted by the Baptists, Congregationalists, and other Dissenters."

"We agree with the Church of England in the position that many congregations —those, for instance, of a whole nation—may form one Scriptural and united church. We also agree with them in this, that an episcopacy, extending over these congregations, consolidating and controlling them, is essentially necessary; —in this only we differ—the Church of England lodges the episcopate in one individual, to whom she gives the title of Bishop,—whereas the Church of Scotland lodges her episcopate in successive gradations of assembled presbyters,—the first superior court comprehending all the presbyters of what is called in England a diocese, and with these constituting the Presbytery of the bounds or diocese, the powers of which are precisely those of the English bishop; the next court is

composed of three or more presbyteries, and is a court of review, called the provincial synod, possessed of powers precisely similar to those of an archbishop in this country."

"The difference between the two churches of Britain is greater apparently than really. Both differ *toto cœlo* from independency. In fact, the latter system is fitted well enough to exist in the position of dissent from an establishment, and especially among those who entertain no respect for church authority, and regard the fluency, or piety, and other valuable qualifications, as the only scriptural requirements for the composition of a Christian minister. In earlier times the two Churches recognised each other by ostensible acts. Such was the respect for Scottish orders among the bishops and reformers of the English Church at the Reformation, and for a century afterwards, that nothing was more common than for a minister of the Scottish, or other reformed churches, to receive a licence from the bishop of the diocese to exercise all the duties of a presbyter, under the superintendence of the ordinary. Strype remarks, in his Annals, 'that the ordination of foreign reformed churches was made valid, and those who had no other orders were made of like capacity with others to enjoy any place of ministry in England. Whittingham, dean of Durham, was objected to by Sandys, archbishop of York, whose orders were from the Church of Rome, but a commission consisting of several dignitaries decided that his orders were good, and stated by the mouth of their president, "They could not in conscience agree to deprive him, or allow of the Popish massing priests in our ministry, and to disallow of ministers made in a reformed church."' Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated presbyters, ordained according to the forms of presbytery, to the offices of bishops, when James I. introduced an order of diocesan bishops into Scotland,—and Burnet states that presbyterial orders were almost universally recognised. To this day, there is nothing in the rubric or articles of the Church of England to prevent a bishop from giving his licence to a presbyterial clergyman to preach in the pulpits of his diocese. With dissenting ministers the case is different. For the principles of a dissenting minister there is no tangible guarantee, as there is neither creed, nor episcopal control, nor regular ordination; and his position as a dissenter necessarily excludes him from the Church. A striking illustration of the views entertained of presbyterial orders in the reign of James I. is found in the following fact: A Dr. De-Laune was presented to a living in the diocese of Norwich. The bishop (Overal) naturally asked him where he obtained his orders; he replied, from the presbytery of Leyden. The bishop refused to re-ordain, in these words,—'Re-ordination we must not admit, no more than re-baptization; but in case you find it doubtful whether you be a priest capable to receive a benefice among us or no, I will do the same office for you, if you desire it, that I should do for one that doubts of his baptism, according to the rule in the Book of Common Prayer, "*If thou beest not already*," &c.; yet for my own part, if you will venture the orders that you have, I will give you institution.'—Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 184. I am not desirous of awakening any controversy on the comparative merits of English or Scottish orders,—of this we have had tenfold too much, in days which are, I trust, forgiven as to their errors, and forgotten as to their excesses. I am anxious simply to convince my brethren in the English Church that our episcopacy and our orders in Scotland are not the one so airy and the other so invalid as some would represent them. The former characteristic of the Scottish Church is seen in every-day practice, more vigourously and effectively exerted than in any other section of Christendom; and the latter, its legitimate offspring, has been recognised by the ablest and holiest bishops of former days,—is contemplated according to Burnet, in the wording of the xxiii. Article, and is not interdicted by any rubric in the English liturgy. While I feel that neither presbytery nor prelacy is chalked out in the word of God as the only form of ecclesiastical government, I am yet persuaded, from the inseparable texture of all rightly organized society, and from a superintendence over ministers distinctly recognised in the New-Testament history, that an episcopacy is of Divine institution, and that the societies destitute of this are, it may be, pious and orthodox, but yet mere assemblies of believers, deprived of any claim to the names of churches. Whitgift goes thus far in his defence, when he says, 'The substance and matter of government must indeed be taken out of the word of God, and consisteth in these points:—that the Word be duly taught, the sacraments rightly administered, virtue furthered, vice repressed, and the church kept in quietness and order (i. e., Episcopal Functions). The offices in the church, whereby this government is wrought, be not namely and particularly expressed in the Scriptures.' Cranmer held 'that bishops and priests were at one time one and not two things.' Hooker's sentiments on this point are an

illustration of our meaning:—'He which affirmeth speech to be necessary amongst all men throughout the world, doth not import that all men must necessarily speak one and the same language: even so the necessity of polity and regimen may hold, without holding any one certain form to be necessary in them all.'—Hooker, b. iii. sec. 2. Without an episcopate, the church has no unity, no controlling discipline, and must in such circumstances present endless fragments and sections, discordant in every thing save their common contempt of all just subordination and rule, and carrying in their bosoms the very elements of their own destruction. It is easy to see the fruits and advantages of an episcopal control of the ministers and congregations of the church. Illiterate men, such as are frequently found among dissenting ministers, are interdicted from an office for which their acquirements justly disqualify, and a standard of literary attainments is insisted on, at once useful to the clergy in conciliating the respect of the community, and in combating the errors of infidelity and Popery; ministers are not subject to the officious intermeddling of every incompetent layman, from the pew-opener upward;—orthodoxy is perpetuated as the standard of the church, and when departures do take place, there is always the symbol of truth to which the superior tribunal can bring back the wanderer, and by which the obstinate perverter of the faith may be tried, errors effectively suppressed, council and control succesfully administered, and the church secured, as far as human instrumentality can secure it, from the whims of every illiterate man that starts into prominence, says what he likes, and fulminates defiance at all the learning, antiquity, and testimonies of past generations. It is therefore my deliberate persuasion, that without an episcopate, or ecclesiastical control, extending over ministers and people, there is wanting one of the finest external developments of that unity existing in the church of Christ, as well as of that great presiding power which is recognised in the institutions of man, in the workmanship of God, and clearly implied in the sacred canon. Isolated independent communities are a miserable mimicry of the catholic church."

"I am not here entering into an argument with dissenters; all I seek to accomplish is, to convince our English brethren in the Establishment that the Church of Scotland has within her the elements of a substantial episcopacy and distinctly develops these in her constitution, though not exactly in the way approved and adopted by her sister establishment, and that so far from there being any identity of ministerial orders between us and certain independent brethren who have claimed it, there is no point perhaps in our respective standings in which we differ more substantially."

"If I did not believe that there exists in the Church of Scotland a regular apostolical succession, as far as it was practicable to obtain it, I would not remain a minister of her communion. It is true, it came through a source polluted enough; but because it did so, it does not cease to be a reality.....If the priests obtained light and grace to abandon Rome, then it became the people to reverence the ordinance of their God, and to seek to the converted ministers for the dispensation of the mysteries of the Gospel. Many of the priests did believe, and thereby God preserved his holy ordinance from an invasion that might have been otherwise imperiously required. Accordingly, the presbyters of the Church of Scotland are the orderly and the lineal successors of those converted priests; those of the Church of England are so also, being, equally with us, ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, over which one arch-presbyter, called by them the bishop, permanently presides."

"The presbyters of the Scottish church trace their ordination upward through the church of Rome we admit, but also, if we had space to demonstrate, through the Culdees to the hands of the apostles themselves, and feel persuaded that neither they nor their predecessors in the holy ministry 'ran unsent.' Far be it from me to place Independent or Baptist without the pale of salvation, or to assert that there are not among these sections of Christendom holy, and devoted, and able preachers of the Gospel of Jesus. There are many such, and if they would keep clear of Popish confederates and political movements, there would be many more.

"We find the apostles received their commission personally from the Lord Jesus, which is the first link in the chain, that they ordained presbyters wherever they had collected congregations of believers, these last their successors, and so on, downward, to the humblest presbytery of the Scottish church. All the directions in the sacred volume, in reference to the ordination and appointment of ministers, are addressed, not to the people, as should have been the case on the independent hypothesis, but to the clergy. When the great apostle of the Gentiles gives directions on ordination, he writes to Timothy, and says, 'Neglect not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying

on of the hands of the presbytery' (1 Tim. iv. 14). And again, in 1 Tim. v. 22, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man.' In fact, no dispassionate reader of the apostolic epistles can fail to observe, that whatever difficulty there may be in the determination of the question of distinction of orders, there can be no question on scriptural ground, as to the transmission of clerical or pastoral power, not from congregations, but through clergy or ministers."

"That our ordination is regular and successional will not be disputed, if we can prove that our reformers were presbyters of the church of Rome, shaking off the abominations which that apostasy had grafted on the ordinances of God, as taught by the apostles, and practised among the Culdee presbyters before the inroads of Popery had almost extinguished them. I have no respect for the futile objections paraded against such succession that it flowed through Rome. That church had not become a hopeless apostasy till the canons of the council of Trent were tied as millstones about her neck. Her priests were not required to subscribe to any other creeds than the Apostles' and the Nicene up to the period stretching from 1545 to 1563, in which the unscriptural dogmas of antichrist, which floated, undefined, in various parts of Christendom, were consolidated, and, in the shape of Pope Pius' creed, made a sine quâ non of admission to the priesthood in the Romish church. Soon after the appearance of the creed of Pope Pius IV., and the inhibition of all priests who would not subscribe to its dogmas, the church of Rome stamped herself the 'forsaken apostasy,' not to be converted, but to be consumed by the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and by the brightness of his coming. Those reformers therefore that came out of the Papacy prior to the authoritative inflictions of the dogmas of Trent on the church of Rome, occupied a position different from that occupied by those who left her pale at a subsequent era. The chief reformers of the Scottish church were of the former class,—namely, Ante-Tridentine priests. Knox, Winram, Spottiswood, Patrick Hamilton, Andrew Melville, Rilloch, and Wishart, were, some of them, converted presbyters of the church of Rome, and others of them ordained by the imposition of their hands. Attempts have been made to prove that Knox was not in orders in the church of Rome; but every investigation has proved most satisfactorily that he was.

"It is all very well, on the part of certain dissenters, to talk about the insignificance of forms of church government, and it is all natural enough to expect that a generation vastly superficial will respond to the sentiment with immense approbation; but let it be borne in mind that this sentiment elevates the theory of independency, and proportionally depresses the principles of those who advocate church order and an episcopacy over each individual minister. In such a sentiment the former have all to gain, but the latter all to lose. Cherishing a catholic spirit—more so, perhaps, than many who have the word continually on their lips—I do hold, nevertheless, that independency is not a scriptural polity, nor its ministers scripturally admitted, nor, as a system, is it likely to promote the peace, the unity, and the prosperity of the church of Christ. I hold the importance of ministerial succession from the days of the apostles; I claim it for my own beloved co-presbyters; and I cannot see that, because this great truth has been abused, it is to be trampled on and despised, as it has been by many who have plunged into the opposite extreme.

"We come now to make a few observations on the present position of the church of Scotland in reference to the civil power. That church, it is well known, is established by law in the same way as is the church of England—mainly supported, however, by the remains of her own ancient property, usurped by the papacy, and most criminally plundered at the Reformation. Our clergy are most admirably provided for as a working parochial clergy; but we want the opportunities of retirement from the labours of daily pastoral duty, in order that our most talented men may get leisure to study for the coming generation, and write lasting memorials of the triumphs of truth over infidelity and superstition. Our Scottish theological works are, in consequence, rather pamphlets than volumes, in comparison of those of the Hookers, the Butlers, the Horsleys, and other giants in the theology of England. A Beattie, a Macknight, a Campbell, and a Chalmers, are rather the exceptions than the rules. This arises, not from want of talent, but from want of time; and, from painful experience on this head, we warn the clergy of the church of England against those sacrilegious attempts that are now made on her cathedral property. The withdrawal of these ancient endowments will be deplored by Christendom. I do confess that I should mourn over the political act that would confiscate the means of supporting the prebendal stalls and the cathedral institutions of England, and the ecclesiastical act also, which would take this property, and allocate it either to the endowment or erection of additional

churches. Let the clergy insist on Government building more churches, as alike its duty and its interest; but leave intact those foci from which the noblest learning of Christendom has been poured out, to the overwhelming of infidelity and popery, and the scattering of the Moabites, and the Midianites, and the Philistines."

"I am fully satisfied that a national church is a sacred ordinance of God, being the nation's mouthpiece, whereby it addresses the Almighty on the one hand, and the organ by which he communicates with the nation on the other. So strongly do I feel this, that I think it incumbent on the children of the Scottish church, scattered and sojourning in these parts, to respect and honour, as far as they can, the institutions of the English establishment, and treat them as such impressions would prescribe. God's two great national institutions in Britain are the two co-ordinate ecclesiastical establishments of England and Scotland. To the former, the children of this land should be attached; and to the latter, the children of

"The land of mountain and of flood;"

the one living in holy fellowship with the other, discarding all ancient feuds and unchristian bigotry—'Ephraim not envying Judah.' While contending for these principles, I cannot yet coincide with some dear brethren in Christ, that there should be no English chapels in Scotland, and no Scottish ones in England. I think the good understanding subsisting between the two communions should always tolerate such friendly interchange of hospitalities, understanding that the isolated English chapels in the north are for gathering English residents, and the Scottish chapels, in the south (what they professedly are) for reclaiming and refreshing, according to an ancient and simple ritual, our Scottish countrymen sojourning here."

"These explanations are very necessary, especially for the information of our fellow-subjects in England; for some persons in this country, in consequence of their ignorance of the subject, speak of the Scottish church, as a branch of the dissenting interest, and of its ministers as unauthorized and self-constituted. It becomes us, therefore, alike on Scripture and on national grounds, to vindicate our character against all such aspersions, and to inform our southern countrymen that our church is national, and established equally with their own; and that our years, as well as theirs, have been matured within the bounds of the parish church, and amid the chime of its sabbath bells; and that, however lowly and poor in this world's goods compared with the riches of our sister-church, which we envy not, we are yet the ministers of a church nobly accredited by the labours of her clergy —the piety of her members—the apostolicity and catholicism of her doctrines — and the dutiful sanction and support of the civil powers. I rejoice in the fact that I am the minister of a national church—that ordinance of God at present so recklessly assailed on every side. Yea, such is my conviction, from much reading and reflection of the scriptural warrant of this great ordinance, that at all hazards, and like my Lord and Master, under all obloquy, I am determined to assert it."

I do not expect you will concur in every statement set forth in the above passages, but I trust you will be of opinion that they contain so much of important and neglected truth, that you will not deny your readers the pleasure and instruction which I am sure they are calculated to afford. P. G.

*** We readily insert the above passages, for three reasons. *First*, because they are decisive as to the question that Congregationalists have no right to claim the administration of Presbyterian trusts under the name of Presbyterians; the matters in discussion between those two denominations not being so slight, that, to use the words of Dr. Smith's affidavit, "the term Presbyterian is, in a fair, just, and honourable sense, and in accordance with its proper signification, capable of being applied to the generality of English Congregationalists." It is clear that Mr. Cumming and his Presbyterian brethren will be as much "startled" as we were at such a declaration. *Secondly*, these passages convey much important truth which Dissenters deny, and even some members of the Church of England are too apt to overlook. The duty of establishing the national worship of God is forcibly urged by Mr. Cumming, and episcopacy is acknowledged by him to be a scriptural institution; thus narrowing down the question respecting it to a

few, though highly important, points; chiefly whether it is to be administered by a distinct order of church officers, or by an assembly of Presbyters. *Thirdly*, Mr. Cumming exhibits towards the Church of England a truly Christian and catholic spirit, which we feel great pleasure in setting in striking contrast with the very different language too often of late used towards it by English and Scottish Dissenters. Widely as differ the ecclesiastical polities of the northern and southern divisions of our island, they are suffering in a common cause as national churches; and while it is highly befitting that their members should seriously study the important points of difference between them, nothing can be more rash and suicidal than the spirit in which this discussion has been too often conducted. There are publications under the influence of members of the Church of Scotland, which still continue to speak of the Church of England as being but a modification of Popery; and affirm that it ought to be subverted; though not on the ground taken by the sect of the voluntaries, of its being a national church, yet on the allegation that it is anti-scriptural in its polity. And then, upon our own side, there is displayed in some quarters a spirit which is not calculated to make our Presbyterian neighbours weigh with impartiality our arguments for episcopacy as a third order. Is the Church of Scotland likely to listen very calmly to those who call her "Samaria?" and have we really gained anything by some of the remarks respecting her at the last monthly Board of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge? Thus stood the case; for though we still retain our objections to verbal reports of speeches, resolutions are matters of document. The Rev. T. V. Short moved that the "Protestant Bishops of the church in Scotland" should be admitted summarily to membership in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Had the word "Protestant" been omitted, there would not have been any thing exclusive in the wording of the resolution, as by the church would be only meant the church to which the members of the Society belonged, whether in England or in its ramifications and alliances, without reference to any other; and Dr. Short himself stated that he did not intend the words to have any bearing upon the question whether what our Queen and the laws of our country acknowledge as the Church of Scotland is really a church, or only a "sham" church; for this epithet we have seen in print. But though Dr. Short for himself disclaimed this meaning, and other members did the same, it is the doctrine urged by those who are endeavouring to bring the Society under the yoke of the Oxford Tracts; maintaining that Rome is our dear sister, without the permission of whose bishops the Society ought not to circulate Bibles, Prayer books, or Tracts, in Roman Catholic countries; whereas the Protestant churches which do not admit the third order are consigned to the uncovenanted mercies of God. To prevent the Society being committed to that meaning, the Rev. J. S. Boone proposed the insertion of the word "episcopal." This amendment was negatived, and Dr. Short's motion was carried. A portion of the majority voted for the original motion, upon the ground that it was not meant o touch upon the question of churching or unchurching the Church of Scotland; but a young clergyman (whose name we do not know), who had no scruple in consigning his Protestant brethren to uncovenanted mercies, gave notice of a motion for omitting the word "episcopal" where it occurs in the Society's second rule for forming district committees, in order to render the Society "consistent with itself." The rule thus altered would run, "District Committees .... may admit members of the united Church of England and Ireland, and of the *Church of Scotland*, to participate in the administration of their local concerns." We fear that had Dr. Chalmers or Mr. Cumming read this amended rule, they would have thought that the Society was seeking their aid as members of "the Church of Scotland;"

little dreaming that by that phrase was meant—not the actual Church of Scotland as acknowledged by law, but—what might perhaps have been the Church of Scotland, if the tyranny of a Laud or the brutalities of a Lauderdale had not made the rent irreparable. We believe that the proposer of this alteration in the Society's rule afterwards withdrew his motion; not, however, upon the ground of principle, but of expediency; as well he might, for his more prudent brethren saw that a wording having been carried which may hereafter be pleaded as unchurching what is by law, and in fact, "the Church of Scotland," it was not well to risk a defeat in altering the Society's rules "in order to be consistent," more especially as the Society's Reports and other documents must be altered very widely, for they speak of "the Episcopal Protestant Church in the United States," as well as in Scotland. Our readers are aware that the gentlemen who adopt the Oxford Tract opinions object altogether to the use of the epithet "episcopal" as applied to "churches," because it seems to imply that there may be churches which are *not* episcopal, such as the Protestant churches in France, Germany, and Switzerland. The necessity which they urge of excinding this epithet wherever it is found in this connexion, proves that they are innovating; for not only must they alter the documents of this Society, but the current phraseology of our most orthodox episcopal writers. We cannot refrain from transcribing the epistle which his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to "the Church of Geneva" upon occasion of the late Jubilee. The Church of Geneva has so corrupted itself, that his Grace might much rather have hesitated in addressing it as a sister communion than that of Scotland. Yet let the reader mark the respect with which he speaks of the Church which Calvin adorned, and of the sister Protestant and Reformed churches; and the severe terms—terms more severe than have often fallen from his Grace's mild and gentle pen—which he uses in alluding to the apostacy which the Oxford Tract divines delight to honour. His Grace, in addressing the Moderator of a Presbyterian assembly as not only Reverend but Very Reverend, puts to shame the foppery of the Hon. and Rev. A. Perceval, who expressed his deep penitence in the columns of a newspaper for having unwittingly addressed Mr. Cumming as reverend, not being aware at the time that he does not belong to any part of Christ's catholic church. We can forgive some young raw converts from Dissent, who may think it their duty to shew their zeal and honesty in their new opinions by outstripping archbishops and bishops; not only conscientiously differing from other Protestant communions, but insulting them; but Mr. Perceval having been educated in the church presided over by a Howley, ought to have known better. We almost wish that Thomas Chalmers, Esquire, (who, though neither Reverend, nor a Doctor of Divinity, but only of heresy, and not a member of "the Church of Scotland" or of any other Christian church, is yet a man who knows how to wield a pen,) would chastise a few of these juvenile disciples of Laud and Sacheverell; but perhaps he will think it time enough when he finds some bishop, or person whose influence gives weight to his opinions, following their example. The following is the archbishop's letter; and let the young men who have been signalizing themselves in these matters remember that it is the Primate of all England whom they are rebuking.

"To the Very Reverend the Moderator of the Company of Pastors of Geneva.

"Lambeth, May 20, 1835.

"Very Rev. Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of the circular letter addressed by the Venerable Company of the Pastors of Geneva to the Prelates and other Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, on the subject of the approaching Jubilee, together with an enclosure to me from yourself, ex-

pressed in terms of respect, of which I am deeply sensible. My brother bishops, as well as myself, are much gratified by this proof of your confidence in our rooted attachment to the holy cause of the Reformation, and on our high respect for the Protestant Churches on the continent, and sincere concern for their welfare.

"We duly appreciate the feeling of religious joy, with which you look forward to the commemoration of that noble achievement, which brought light out of darkness, and rescued your Church from the shackles of Papal domination, and the tyrannical imposition of a corrupt faith and a superstitious ritual. It is not without reason that you are anxious to testify your veneration for the memory of those illustrious men, who under the direction of Almighty God were the instruments of this happy deliverance, and at the same time to offer up your songs of thanksgiving to the great Head of the Church, as well for the blessing bestowed on you at that memorable epoch, as for the continued preservation of this sacred deposit from the malice of powerful enemies, encompassing you on every side, and often seeking your destruction.

"Although we are exceedingly gratified by the desire expressed by your Venerable Company for the appointment of deputies to assist at the Festival as representatives of the Clergy of England, we cannot consistently with the practice of our Church avail ourselves of this obliging invitation. But you may be assured of our cordial sympathy: and I cannot refrain from expressing a hope that this solemn celebration of an event not less glorious to the city of Geneva, than conducive to the success of the Reformation, may be attested with an abundant effusion of religious blessings; that the Spirit of Christ may unite your Community in zeal for the truth, in the profession of pure evangelical faith, in charity one with another; and that you may be for ever preserved from that anti-Christian despotism, which is equally hostile to intellectual improvement, to civil and religious liberty, and to the fundamental principles of the Gospel.

"I remain with great respect,

"Very Reverend Sir,

"Your faithful and obedient servant,

"W. CANTAUR."

These sentiments of his Grace towards the sister Protestant churches are not novel; indeed it would be difficult to find, among all the writings of his Most Reverend predecessors from Cranmer to the present time, with the exception of Laud, one single document couched in a different spirit. We speak not of the warm fraternal expressions of such archbishops as Wake, Tenison, Tillotson, or Secker, who are called low church men; but even Sancroft himself holds the same language. These Most Reverend prelates did not think lightly of episcopacy or apostolical succession; nor does any true Churchman; but they rejoiced in their own privileges, without going about to denounce other communions. Archbishop Wake says:—"I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an Episcopal Church, which, I am convinced, has been the government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm, that where the ministry is not Episcopal, there is no church nor any true administration of the sacraments." He elsewhere says that he would not have the "iron heart" of "certain raving writers" who thought that "the Reformed churches have no valid sacraments, and so pronounce them scarcely Christian." The late venerable Bishop White of America, in quoting Archbishop Wake's remark as expressing his own sentiment, alters "iron heart" into "obdurate heart," and "raving" into "over ardent,"—a

practice which we must always condemn, even where the unacknowledged substitution is an improvement.

Let us next listen to Archbishop Sancroft, as quoted by Dr. D'Oyly in his interesting memoir of that prelate. The Archbishop gives the following pastoral injunction to his clergy:—

"That they also walk in wisdom towards those that are not of our communion; and if there be in their parishes any such, that they neglect not frequently to confer with them in the spirit of meekness, seeking by all good ways and means to gain and win them over to our communion: more especially, that they have a very tender regard to our brethren the Protestant Dissenters; that upon occasion offered, they visit them at their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them; persuading them (if it may be) to a full compliance with our Church, or at least that 'whereto we have already attained, we may all walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing.'".....And, in the last place, that they warmly and most affectionately exhort them to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of Peace, *for the universal blessed union of all Reformed churches both at home and abroad against our common enemies;* that all they, who do confess the holy name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of his holy word, may also meet in one holy communion, and live in perfect unity and godly love."

Archbishop Sancroft here follows Cranmer, and precedes Tillotson, Tenison, Wake, Secker, and Howley—not to mention intermediate links, above and below—in giving to the Reformed churches their legitimate title, regarding them as sisters, and speaking of Rome as the common enemy. Contrast this with the language of the Oxford Tracts, which teach—"Whatever may be our *private differences* [private differences!] with the Roman Catholics,.....God forbid that we should ally ourselves with the offspring of heresies and schism [that is, with what Archbishop Sancroft called the "Reformed churches at home and abroad"] in our contest with any branch of the holy church [Rome is the holy church!] which maintain the foundation, whatever may be their incidental corruptions."

Sancroft was a non-juror; and the non-jurors for the most part adopted the extreme class of opinions on this subject. Leslie, for instance, never once that we remember admits the claim of the non-episcopal communions to the title of churches,—indeed, he repeatedly says that they had no valid baptism or administration of the Lord's Supper; and yet, singularly enough, he once uses the epithet "episcopal" in the very manner objected to by Mr. Dodsworth and his friends at the Christian Knowledge meeting, as involving a sacrifice of principle; for he says, in the preface to his Discourse on Water-Baptism, "In Oxford the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not administered in the whole university, from the ejection of *the episcopal clergy* in the year 1648 to the restoration in 1660,"—a most extraordinary statement, since he does not mean merely not in the Anglican form, but not in *any* form whatever; but which, being explained, implies, we suppose, only that the members communicated in their several spiritual societies, and not academically as collegians. But it was to the epithet "episcopal" that we intended to call attention, as the use of it is now voted to be superfluous and degrading to the apostolical church, as implying that there may be churches or clergy not episcopal. But though the non-jurors were generally inclined to exclusionism, yet we may judge from the example of Sancroft that the more moderate of them were satisfied with vindicating their own holy orders and apostolical succession, without unchurching other churches. We will

produce in proof of this a very remarkable passage from a book little known entitled "An Answer to J. O.'s (John Owen's) Arguments for Ordination by Presbyters without Bishops: by J. Thomas, Rector of Penegoes, in Montgomeryshire." This book was finished in 1694, but was not published till 1711 (the year after Sacheverell's trial), when it was given to the world, after the author's death, with a recommendatory preface by the Rev. Dr. George Hickes, the well-known non-juror, who had been consecrated by some of his Right Reverend non-juring brethren, at the instigation of the exiled James, as suffragan Bishop of Thetford. Hickes calls it a "judicious and excellent answer" to "an adversary of great note among the Dissenters," and says that it was highly approved by Bishop Lloyd and Bishop Humphrys, who had perused it in manuscript, and the former of whom interlined it with his own additions and corrections for the press. The work contains much sound and valuable argument;—yet, while it vindicates in the strongest terms diocesan episcopacy and episcopal ordination, it speaks of the "Reformed *churches*," not unchurching them because through error or hindrance they had not diocesan bishops; and puts forth the following passage, which Dr. Hickes and his Right Reverend coadjutors must have specially noticed, as it occurs in the second paragraph of the book, and yet they did not alter it. "I wish," says Thomas, "that J. O. had forborne those reflections in the end of his epistle. There is a sting in the tail of it, where he says, Most Protestants are unchurched, and their holy administrations arraigned as nullities. Who are they by whom this is done? The pleader saith, By some of the dignitaries of the Church of England. But though he speaks much of Scripture, he does not always speak common truth. I dare say he cannot name one of those dignitaries that, as he phrases it, in his way, anathematizes all the Reformed churches that have no bishops; though some may have wished that they would all find out some way to get their orders made more complete and unexceptionable. If he can, I desire him to name one when he writes next; till he does, he may guess what other people will think of him." Here, then, we find a zealous writer for episcopacy asserting, in the year 1694, in a work against Presbyterianism, that it was a calumny to say that any dignitary of the Church of England had ever unchurched the Presbyterian churches; and this assertion is perused, but not altered, by two prelates who corrected the manuscript, and is printed after seventeen years' deliberation, by Dr. Hickes the non-juror, himself a titular prelate, without the slightest note of dissent: though in strictness the statement was not true; for some dignitaries, as Laud, though but few, had unchurched the sister Protestant churches; and some of the non-jurors did so, and Hickes himself, by inference at least, among the number.

But it will probably be said, in reply, that many eminent divines believed in the apostolical episcopal succession, who did not duly carry it out to all its consequences, as Laud and Sacheverell honestly did. This is Mr. Keble's statement respecting Hooker. That judicious defender of Anglican polity, we are told, was right but he was inconsistent; he espoused diocesan episcopacy, but he did not un-church, as he ought to have done, the Protestant churches which have it not. Now this is an inconsistency which, as we have shown, and might show much more at large, pervades the writings of the most celebrated divines of our Church, with the exception of those who, like the Oxford Tract writers, go the length of Laud—that is, of the Church of Rome itself—in this matter. Cranmer, our first Protestant Archbishop, was thus inconsistent; and so is our present Archbishop, Dr. Howley; and cruelly might Mr. Newman, Mr. Dodsworth, Dr. Pusey, or Mr. Keble, gore his Grace on the horns of their dilemma, if they did not find it more politic to affect that to speak of the Church of Geneva, or the Church of

Scotland, is the language only of ultra Protestants, "the members of a certain party within our Church," and not of sound episcopalians like his Grace.

This charitable inconsistency, we assert—if inconsistency it be—has pervaded the writings of our best divines, nay, the public actions and decisions of our Church itself. If this allegation be denied, we are prepared to sustain it by a score pages of proof; but we are not willing to inflict that burthen on our readers without necessity. The Oxford Tract writers cannot deny, though they bitterly lament, that our reformers and martyrs regarded the Protestant Churches as sister communions, and Rome as "the common enemy." They cannot deny that foreign Presbyterian ordination was practically, however inconsistently, reckoned valid during the reigns of Edward, of Elizabeth, and of the Jameses and Charleses. At the celebrated Presbyterian synod of Dort, five English divines, including the three eminent prelates, Carleton, Hall, and Davenant, took their seats officially as the representatives of the Church of England, and did precisely what we have above stated—they defended their own apostolical communion, but unchurched not others.• They say, in their account of their proceedings: "Peradventure some hot spirit would not have rested in a formal recorded protestation, but would have charged those Churches to blot those articles out of their Confession, and forthwith to reform their government, otherwise not have yielded to any article of doctrine as there comprised, but renounced the synod, and shaking off from his feet the dust of Dort, saying, 'I have nothing to do with your conclusions; I have no part nor portion in them; what ends you have, how things are carried, I cannot tell, nor care.' We confess, we were, and are of another mind; our own dispositions, and the directions of our blessed peace-making King, kept us from kindling new fires where we had work enough to quench the old. We then thought, and so still in our consciences are confident, that we forgot not our duty to our venerable and sacred mother, the Church of England, but took a course conformable to the rules as well of filial obedience as of Christian moderation."

We leave our modern sticklers for consistency—that is, for running all reasonable truths to the most unreasonable consequents—to settle as they can the consistency of Bishop Hall, the accredited text-writer on episcopacy; and also of Hooker, who, while he maintains that scriptural institution, and the doctrine of apostolical succession, yet adds, "Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, where the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained; and neither hath nor can possibly have a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity the ordinary institution of God *hath given oftentimes, and may give, place.* And therefore we are not, simply without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continual succession of bishops in every effectual ordination." (*Eccl. Polity*, book vii. ch. 14.) In this passage, Hooker not only supposes an exigence, but asserts that it has often occurred; so that we are not at liberty, he says, to consider apostolical succession indispensable to ordination. We do not ourselves admit that a necessity of breaking the episcopal lineage has ever occurred where there was a wish to retain it. It was preserved among the persecuted Waldenses and Moravians; it was preserved in England at the Reformation, and after the Marian relapse; it outlived in Scotland the terrors of penal laws; it was planted in the United States of America, notwithstanding political jealousies and the national estrangement of the recent revolution; Calvin might have had it for Switzerland, and all the other continental reformers for their respective churches, from the English stock; for we doubt not that even the Huguenots might have found some Protestant prelate who did not think, with the Oxford Tract divines, that it is schism to consecrate a re-

formed bishop in a papal country. But whether Hooker be right or wrong in his alleged fact, his opinion is perfectly clear.

If the late Bishop Tomline could revisit the arena of this changeful world, he would be surprised to find that he must coalesce with his old antagonist Mr. Scott, in withstanding the innovations of Oxford divines. Listen to his remarks on the twenty-third article. "No particular mode of ordination," says the Bishop, "is here declared to be a necessary object of faith, nor are any persons specified by whom ministers are to be ordained to their sacred function; it is only asserted in general terms, that they are to receive their appointment from the authority prescribed by the church to which they belong; and as this proposition is not contrary to any precept of Scripture, its truth will be allowed by all who admit the necessity of an established ministry." "Though I flatter myself that I have proved Episcopacy to be an Apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government: but though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship; though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers; and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree: yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country: they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society; with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. But he has, in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men, as free agents." (Elements of Theology, Vol. II. 380—382.)

We have had great pleasure in discharging this debt of Christian brotherhood towards the family of Protestant Churches; but having done so; we must not conclude without affirming, in the strongest terms, our conviction that diocesan episcopacy is a Scriptural and Apostolical institution. Mr. Cumming's arguments appear to us irrefragable against the Congregationalist; but when he comes to speak of the question between the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian, we must say, that in our opinion they break down. As he does not urge the matter in a controversial spirit, neither will we; but we cannot think that an Episcopacy lodged in a commission (so to speak), and not in an individual of a higher order than a mere presbyter, answers to that governing power of which he admits there are ample traces in the New Testament, and in early church history. We are quite willing to discuss the whole bearings of this important question as often as it is necessary. The chief point for inquiry is, was there apart from the Apostolic order—which all allow to have been only special—another order exercising Episcopal functions? The particular word translated "Bishop," is not insisted upon, as Episcopalians admit, as much as Independents and Presbyterians, that it is often used in the New Testament as synonimous with Presbyter; and that it was only afterwards, as Theodoret attests, that it came to bear the specific restricted sense in which it is now popularly applied; and there is much either of ignorance or unfairness in urging against us the large use of the word in the New Testament, as if this bore upon the point in question; and yet this is one of the

most common and popular arguments among Congregational dissenters. But Episcopalians maintain that there was in the apostolical church an office, call it by what name we may, higher than that of presbyter, though not apostolic; the office to which Timothy and Titus were appointed for ordaining presbyters, and presiding over the general body of pastors, and exercising all the functions of episcopacy; the office pointed out many years after in the Apocalypse in the addresses to the Angels of the Seven Churches; and that this office was personal, and not the joint authority of a church assembly, or the temporary chairmanship, as it were, of a moderator. The addresses to Timothy, Titus, and the Angels, are so strictly personal, that to suppose them pointing out duties to be discharged by a church court presents to our minds a difficulty even greater than that of the Congregational hypothesis; so that if we were not Episcopalians, we fear we might be tempted to become Independents, rather than Presbyterians. Then again, Church history for fifteen centuries is decisive as to the facts of the question; and though we disclaim tradition as authority, it is of great importance as a testimony to usage. What then is the fact? We find Timothy and Titus personally consecrated to the office of diocesan episcopacy; in the Apocalypse we read of similar officers under the name of Angels; the earliest Christian writers back to the apostolic times speak of the same office as then existing in the Church; and this office continued without question till the Protestant Reformation; and even Calvin, and all the most celebrated Reformers, admitted that Diocesan Episcopacy was the Apostolic form, though some of them considered themselves driven by circumstances to admit the Presbyterian discipline. Had it been an innovation or usurpation, some traces of its introduction must have appeared in the controversial records of the Church; but there is nothing of the kind. We have one uniform stream of testimony from the days of the Apostles; we have one concurrence of practice in communions widely separated from each other, perhaps hostile to each other, or unknown to each other—and some of them tracing back their history to Apostolic times, without being offsets from other existing sections of the present visible Church of Christ. Whether we read the Acts of the Apostles, and the letters of St. Paul to the diocesans of Ephesus and Crete; or the inspired messages to the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea; or the primitive though uninspired testimonies of Clemens Romanus, of Ignatius, who was cotemporary with the Apostles, and of Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, and Tertullian, who immediately succeeded them; or of Origen and Jerome in a later though still early age; or the remarkable proceedings in the Council of Sardis; or the history of the Greek, and Latin, and Armenian, and Coptic, and Abyssinian, and Indo-Syrian churches; we come to the same conclusion; and we no more doubt that there has been a succession of diocesan bishops than of presbyters. Still, as there is no distinct direct command in the New Testament, that there should be this disparity of orders, we do not think that the conscientious tenacity with which we feel it our duty and privilege to cling to diocesan episcopacy, as in our view the appointed mode of government of Christ's Church, binds us to the conclusion that there can be no church or sacrament in those protestant communions which considered the point doubtful, or not essential, or scripturally determined on the other side. We earnestly wish, however, that pains were taken by our clergy to inform their flocks of the solid scriptural claims of episcopacy; so that their minds might be established in the truth for their own comfort and edification; and that they might be enabled to reply to the arguments both of those who would rob them of their privilege as members of a church founded upon the Apostolical model, and of those who would seduce them to the apostacy of Rome by sophistries in disparagement of our orders and sacraments.

One remark more. Our blessed Lord prayed that his disciples might all be one; and unity is constantly predicated of his Church. But looking at that Church in its militant condition here on earth, it appears scattered and disunited; and hence comes a stumbling-block, both to its friends and its enemies. To remove this stumbling-block, the Latin usurpation set up its universal pontiff, thus unchurching all who will not bow to the bishop of Rome; and various sectional communions have followed this schismatical example. Now we well know the pain and bewilderment of an ingenuous inquirer after religious truth, when he begins to reflect upon these unbrotherly separations. He is told indeed, that there is an unseen spiritual union among all the faithful in Christ, of all ages and countries; but he wishes to grasp something more substantial. You are right in so wishing, said the Church of Rome to the Honourable and Reverend Mr. Spencer; there must be unity, and we have that essential mark of apostolicity. He listened to the sophism, and was carried away to Popery. The Church of Rome, say the divines of the Oxford Tract school, is partly right and partly wrong; it is right in making the Apostolical Episcopal succession the basis of unity, so that wherever that is found there is a church, and wherever it is wanting there is none; but it is wrong in restricting that succession within the limits assigned to it by the papal writers; it ought at the least to have included the Church of England and its sister and daughter Episcopal communions. Now, not a few young men are seduced by this apparently liberal extension of a definite rule. We have obtained, say they, just what we want; amidst all the conflictions of human opinion, we can now ascertain by a practical test what is the true church of Christ; we have nothing to do in this matter with men's doctrines or character; we have but to ask what is their ecclesiastical lineage, and that ascertained, we know at once whether they belong to the sacred brotherhood or not. Thus the craving of the restless mind for certainty and infallibility is gratified; there arises a feeling of confidence and firm footing which was not before enjoyed; we, at least, are right, whoever is wrong; and little is thought of the millions of Christ's servants who are excommunicated by an attempt to frame an infallible rule which is not laid down in Scripture. The best human commentary upon what the Word of God says respecting these matters is that contained in the Homily for Whitsunday. It is indeed indefinite, as all such rules must be indefinite, since questions arise as to the meaning of the terms employed; as, for instance, what is "sound doctrine?" and when are "the sacraments administered according to Christ's holy institution?" but it describes the Scriptural conditions, though leaving the true application of them to be extrinsically ascertained. It is very remarkable, however, that it seems to unchurch the very church which the Oxford divines are so anxious to make us embrace as a beloved sister. The passage is as follows:—

"The Holy Ghost was given, not only to the Apostles, but also to the whole body of Christ's congregation, although not in like form and majesty as he came down at the feast of Pentecost. But now, herein standeth the controversy: Whether all men do justly arrogate to themselves the Holy Ghost or not. The Bishops of Rome have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto, reasoning for themselves after this sort:—The Holy Ghost, say they, was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church. But we are the chief heads and principal part of the Church; therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever, and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities, and oracles of the Holy Ghost. That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true Church of Christ is; and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how well they agree together. The true Church is a uni-

versal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone; and it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known—pure and sound doctrine; the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution; and the right use of Ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith.

"Now if you will compare this with the Church of Rome—not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd—you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the state of the true Church, that nothing can be more; for neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the Ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as he did first institute and ordain them."—(*Homily for Whitsunday.*)

ON THE DANGERS OF RE-ACTION FROM EXAGGERATED STATEMENTS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I WISH, Mr. Editor, among the many dangers which threaten the church of Christ, you would warn your readers against one which is of a very powerful character, though often of unsuspected influence —I mean what is aptly called RE-ACTION. There is danger, wherever a point is pressed too strongly, that those who are not urged forward by the impulse will recoil towards the opposite extreme. We may witness this in the effect produced by exaggerations in sermons, speeches, newspapers, and books of all sorts. The proverbially unmeasured statements of proselytes and renegades—where the parties are honest, and not time-servers—may be accounted for upon this principle; for it is difficult for a man to quit those with whom he has been long accustomed to think and act, without verging to excess on the opposite side. But truth is sober; and to arrive at it we must weigh opposite conditions, and decide calmly upon them. I would, sir, that Churchmen and Dissenters, that Tories and Whigs, that Arminians and Calvinists, would consider this, and not rush to the antipodes in order to shun an opponent whom they would be quite far enough off from by simply taking up their abode in the delectable and temperate region of truth, which lies equally distant between the north and south poles of error. The pending controversies in our Church particularly call for this seasonable caution. The superstitious doctrines and sacerdotal pretensions of the Romish hierarchy make sceptics of those whom they do not enslave; so that while the ignorant portion of the community become abject devotees, the intellectual are too apt to become concealed infidels. Every thing overstrained is thus liable to cause revulsion, and ought to be guarded against by those who desire to have the mind which was in Christ Jesus.

SOSIPATER.

*** We have often warned ourselves and our readers against the danger which Sosipater describes; but we are glad to repeat the admonition, more especially in relation to several much agitated topics. In refusing, for instance, to acknowledge the authority of tradition in matters of faith, we must not despise

the memorable testimony of the early writers of the Church; in adhering to inspired Scripture, we must not undervalue the blessed labours of wise, devout, and learned men, whether in the early church or in later ages, who have studied, according to the grace given to them, to unfold its meaning; in rejecting the usurpations of the Papal priesthood, we must not forget the Scriptural character of the ministers of Christ as stewards of Divine mysteries, ambassadors for God, and the appointed administrators of His word and sacraments; in denying the *ex opere operato* virtue of the holy sacraments, we must not degrade them into barren signs, as though they were not also seals, and pledges, and means of grace; and in discarding the Popish notions respecting mortal and venial sin, and the anti-evangelical doctrine that sin after baptism precludes our recurring again and again to the blood of Christ for pardon, we must not fail to point out constantly and energetically the great guilt and danger of every despite done to the Holy Spirit, and in a very marked manner of those aggravations of transgression which result from the violated vows of baptism. We might mention many similar examples; for even the blessed doctrine of justification by faith may be abused to the purposes of antinomianism; and the necessity of holiness of heart and life, in the zeal of controversy, be set forth so as to make it wear the aspect of legal, instead of Gospel, obedience. One of the devices of our spiritual adversary is to overload a truth which he cannot suppress; and then to represent those who would remove the adventitious matter as attacking the truth itself. Controversialists must expect to bear this reproach, but they should take care they do not deserve it. In this, as in all other things, our Divine Lord has given us an example that we should walk in his steps.

While thus alluding to the dangers of re-action, especially in religious controversy, we will copy a monitory passage on this subject from the conclusion of Bishop Burnet's History of his own Times. The bishop's warning is not less applicable now than it was in the year 1708, when it was written.

"I see a spirit," he says, "rising among us, too like that of the Church of Rome, of advancing the clergy beyond their due authority, to an unjust pitch: this rather heightens jealousies and prejudices against us, than advances our real authority: and it will fortify the designs of profane infidels, who desire nothing more than to see the public ministry of the Church first disgraced, and then abolished. The carrying any thing too far does commonly lead men into the other extreme: we are the dispensers of the word and sacraments; and the more faithful and diligent we are in this, the world will pay so much the more respect and submission to us: and our maintaining an argument for more power than we now have, will be of no effect, unless the world sees that we make a good use of the authority that is already in our hands: it is with the clergy as with princes; their only way to keep their prerogative from being uneasy to their subjects, and from being disputed, is to manage it wholly for their good and advantage; then all will be for it, when they find it is for them: this will prevail more effectually than all the arguments of lawyers, with all the precedents of former times. Therefore let the clergy live and labour well, and they will feel that as much authority will follow that, as they will know how to manage well. And to speak plainly; Dodwell's extravagant notions, which have been too much drunk in by the clergy in my time, have weakened the power of the Church, and soured men's minds more against it than all the books wrote, or attempts made against it, could ever have done." The bishop adds;—"The violences of Archbishop Laud, and his promoting arbitrary power, ruined himself and the Church both. A return of the like practices will bring with it the like dreadful consequences."

To this admonition of Bishop Burnet respecting the danger of reaction from exaggerated statements, we will add a passage from a sermon preached in 1819, before the Prayer-Book and Homily Society, by the present Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India, whose name we cannot mention without informing our readers that his Lordship has just published an admirable volume of sermons containing the discourses delivered by him during his primary visitation, and which are peculiarly valuable for their clear statements of Scriptural truth and earnest and powerful applications of it to the heart and conscience. They amply confute the sneer of a dissenting journalist, that "Daniel Calcutta is not Daniel Wilson." Whatever of piety, of ability, of eloquence, of faithfulness, is identified with the latter name will be found in a wider sphere connected with the former. But to our quotation from the discourse of 1819, in relation to the danger of re-action from overcharged statements. "There is nothing," says Bishop Wilson, "of which I am more deeply convinced, than that the security of any Protestant church, and therefore of our own, is the blessing of God on the simple and commanding doctrine of Christ Jesus. To magnify matters which relate merely to the constitution, and as it were the scaffolding, of the spiritual edifice; to give *an overcharged and almost Popish exposition of the necessarily general and charitable language of sacramental offices;* to assume as a matter unquestionable the purity of the doctrine preached by the ministers of religion—from which, after all, the majority of a nation will chiefly judge of the tenets of a church, and on which the conversion, edification, and salvation of each passing age so much depend—and to hold at a distance, and refuse any intercourse of charity with, Christians of other confessions, in the greatest and most simple of causes—the circulation, for instance, of the Holy Scriptures throughout the world by a variety of societies for that purpose;—all this, if any thing of this kind should ever be prevalent in any Protestant church, would, in my judgment, go to loosen its foundations; and in a day of general inquiry and information, and among a free and noble-minded people, would tend eventually to degrade its character, and materially diminish its influence and safety."

We will bring down the admonition to a later date, by quoting a passage from the Episcopal charges of another living prelate—the unweariedly diligent, exemplary, and much honoured Bishop of Winchester, who remarked in his primary charge at Llandaff, in 1827:—"That spell is past, by which the very name of a clergyman, in common acceptation, carried with it associations of a sacred character, and stamped its bearer as a holy man, to whom respect was paid, if not on his own account, for his very order's sake.....Do I wish to recall those days of almost superstitious reverence for the priesthood, when the dominion of the clergy over the minds of men deserved less to be considered as the legitimate ascendancy of high talent and extraordinary piety, than as the offspring of a monopoly of learning in an age of darkness—the despotism of exclusive knowledge over ignorance and its associate, error? No, my reverend brethren, happily for ourselves, as well as the world in general, whatever be the character we enjoy, it cannot be acquired by hereditary charter, or put on at pleasure, as belongiug to the habit of our profession. Respect must be deserved before it can be won; and as, generally speaking, it will be rarely long withheld when it is fairly due, so it will seldom be long conferred contrary to desert, however high the office or sacred the functions of him who challenges it."

111541

ON THE REV. J. NEWMAN'S LECTURES ON ROMANISM:—TRADITION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

(Continued from page 48.)

MUCH is made, by Mr. Newman, of the practice of the Fathers in referring to Tradition. The reason of this he does not clearly or correctly state. Every thing depends on the grounds on which tradition was adduced, and on what was understood by the term. The following quotation from Bishop Burnet, on the Articles, represents the case very clearly and very satisfactorily:—"It is plain that the Gnosticks, the Valentinians, and other heretics, began very early to set up a pretension to a tradition delivered by the Apostles to some particular persons, as a key for understanding the secret meanings that might be in Scripture; in opposition to which both Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, make one of two sorts of arguments. The one is the authority of the Scripture itself, by which they confuted their errors; the other is a point of fact, that there was no such tradition. In asserting this, they appeal to those Churches which had been founded by the Apostles, and in which succession of bishops had been continued down. They say, In these we must search for Apostolical tradition. This was not said by them as if they had designed to establish tradition as an authority distinct from or equal to the Scriptures; but only to show the falsehood of that pretence of the heretics, and that there was no such tradition for their heresies as they gave out."—Exactly the same view should be taken of tradition when referred to by some of our Reformers in their disputes with the Romanists. They gave no authority themselves to tradition; but as the Romanists pleaded it, they denied, and justly, that early tradition was in their favour, but maintained that it was decidedly and expressly against them. The reason for the appeal to tradition has been exactly the same in latter times, as in former ages. It was made by our Reformers, as it was made by the early Fathers, for the purpose of destroying the claims of false tradition, and not for the purpose of making tradition the test of truth or the rule of faith. They referred to it as corroborative of what they held as the doctrines of the Bible. It was heretics that made the first appeal to tradition; and the orthodox did so in self-defence, "to clear themselves," as Bishop Burnet says, "from the imputation of having innovated any thing in the doctrine or in the ways of expressing it *." And what if some of the Fathers did lay great stress on tra-

* In no other way but this, can we account for the strong things they say in some parts in favour of tradition, and for their many express declarations that nothing is valid but what the Scriptures contain. When they contended with heretics who pleaded tradition, they adduced tradition to confute them: and yet they spoke of Scripture as the only rule of faith. The author of the "Whole Duty of Man," in his book called "the Lively Oracles," has collected, on this last subject, the opinions of the Fathers of any note during the first centuries, some extracts from which shall in a brief form be added here; pp. 167—176.

"The disposition of our salvation is no otherwise known by us, than by those by whom the Gospel was brought to us; which indeed they first preached, but afterward delivered to us in the Scripture, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith."—*Irenæus.*

"I adore the plenitude of Scripture ..... let Hermogenes and his journeymen show that it is written. If it be not written, let him fear the woe which belongs to them that add or detract."—*Tertullian.*

dition, and exalt it to a second or first rule of faith? Except it be *proved* that they did this on Divine authority, what they did is not binding on us. They maintained, held, and practised many things, which have been long neglected, and deserve to be so. The rule laid down by Vincentius, in the fourth century, for discovering the true faith and the true church, is very ingenious—but human, and not Divine. It might do in his day for the purpose of silencing heretics; but it is sadly misapplied, when brought forward to weaken or neutralize, in any degree, the supreme and exclusive authority of the Scriptures.

The notions of our author respecting the Apostles' creed, and the use he makes of it, are very strange. He says that the Church teaches first the creed, or bears testimony to the creed as containing the essential doctrines of the Catholic faith, and appeals to Scripture for proof. If he refers to its elementary teaching—to what the Church teaches children—how does he separate the creed from the catechism? And as to public teaching, the Word of God is what our Church requires to be taught first and last; and not any tradition, or what is called the Catholic truth. The Scripture, it seems, is only for proof; but the Catholic truth is to be taught! Now, if the Scripture (which he admits) is the final test of truth, what is the use of making the Church to go this useless round; and how is the point to be maintained, that tradition is a supplement to Scripture, and the expositor of Scripture, with which he seems to hold? The scheme, it appears, is this: The Church does not preach Scripture, or bear witness to it, but to traditionary or Catholic truth; and then refers to Scripture for proof, as the final test of truth. And this is not all, for the Church then, as it seems, brings forward tradition as the interpreter of the final test, the Scripture! Thus Scripture is at first put in the back-

"Whosoever of us will preserve piety towards God, he cannot otherwise learn it than from the Holy Scripture."—*Hyppolytus.*

"Whence is this tradition? Is it from the authority of our Lord and his Gospel, or comes it from the commands of the Apostles in their epistles? Almighty God declares, that what is written should be obeyed and practised. If truth have swerved or failed in any particular, we go backward to the source of Evangelical and Apostolical tradition."—*Cyprian.*

"What are those things which we ought to inquire into? Even those which are to be found in the Scriptures. Those things which are not there to be found, let us not seek after."—*Eusebius.*

"It is fit for us to adhere to the word of God, and not relinquish it. Ask not concerning the Trinity; but learn only from the Scriptures: for the instructions which you will find there are sufficient."—*Athanasius.*

"There is no earthly judge, but one is to be sought from above. Yet there is no need of a resort to heaven, when we have in the Gospel a testament. The Lord who left his will among us, is now in heaven; therefore let us seek his commands in the Gospel, as in his will."—*Optatus.*

"Believe those (things) which are written; seek not those (things) which are not written."—*Basil.*

"How can we make use of any thing which is not to be found in the Scripture?"—*Ambrose.*

"As we deny not that which is written; so we refuse those which are not written."—*Jerome.*

"The Holy Scripture settles the rule of our doctrine," (which is the same thing as the rule of our faith.)"—*Augustine.*

"It is the suggestion of a diabolical spirit to think that any thing besides the Scripture has Divine authority."—*Theophilus* of Alexandria.

"If the appeal were to reason, in this case there would be just cause of being troubled: but we appeal to the Scriptures, and they are simple and certain, you may easily yourself judge. He that agrees with the Scriptures, is a Christian; he that resists them, is far out of the way. I pray and exhort you, that giving no heed to what this or that man says, you would consult the Holy Scriptures, and thence learn the Divine riches, and pursue what you have learnt."—*Chrysostom.*

ground; and when brought forward, it is not allowed to speak but as tradition dictates to it. If this be not pure Romanism, I know not what is. It is too late in the day, I hope, for such anti-protestant and anti-scriptural notions to meet with any success among the members of the Anglican or any other reformed Church. The following are a few extracts from Bishop Jeremy Taylor, on the subject of tradition, taken from the volume of his *Polemical Discourses*, pp. 979—984.

"When the Fathers appeal to tradition, and with much earnestness and some clamour they call upon heretics to conform to, or be tied by, tradition, it is such a tradition as delivers the fundamental points of Christianity, which were also *recorded in Scripture*. That they did rather urge tradition against them than Scripture, was because the public doctrine of all the Apostolical Churches was *at first* more known and famous than many parts of the Scripture, and because some heretics denied St. Luke's Gospel, some received none but St. Matthew's, some rejected all St. Paul's Epistles; and it was a long time before the whole canon was consigned by universal testimony, some churches having one part, some another —Rome herself had not all—so that, in this case the argument from tradition was the most famous, the most certain, and the most prudent. And now, according to this rule, they had more traditions than we have; and traditions by degrees did lessen as they came to be written, and their necessity was less as the knowledge of them was ascertained to us by a better keeper of Divine truths. There is, indeed, scarce any thing but what is written in Scripture, that can with any confidence of argument pretend to derive from the Apostles, except rituals and manners of ministration; but no doctrines or speculative mysteries are so transmitted to us by so clear a current, that we may see a visible channel, and trace it to the primitive fountains. Either for the difficulty of their being proved, the incompetency of the testimony that transmits them, or the indifferency of the thing transmitted, all traditions, both ritual and doctrinal, are disabled from determining our consciences either to a necessary believing or obeying. It was an excellent saying of Basil, and will never be wiped out with all the eloquence of Perron, in his *Serm. de Fide*—"Manifestus est fidei lapsus, et liquidum superbiæ vitium, vel respuere aliquid eorum quæ scriptura habet, vel inducere quicquam quod scriptum non est." (It is a manifest fall from the faith, and the clear vice of pride, either to refuse any thing of what the Scripture contains, or to introduce any thing that is not written.) No man is materially a heretic, but he that errs in a point of faith; and all faith is sufficiently recorded in Scripture; the judgment of faith and heresy is to be derived from thence; and no man is to be condemned for dissenting in an article for whose probatum tradition only is pretended. It is said that there are traditive interpretations, as well as traditive propositions; but these have not much distinct consideration in them, both because their uncertainty is as great as the other upon the former considerations, as also, because in very deed there are no such things as traditive interpretations universal. . . . They are no more argument than the particular authority of those men whose commentaries they are. Beside the no-necessity of traditions—there being abundantly enough in Scripture —there are many things called traditions by the Fathers which they themselves either proved by no authors, or by apocryphal, and spurious, and heretical. The matter of tradition will *in very much* be so uncertain, so false, so suspicious, so contradictory, so improbable, so unproved, that if a question be contested, and be offered to be proved only by tradition, it will be very hard to impose such a proposition to the belief of all men with an imperiousness or resolved determination; but it will be necessary that men should preserve the liberty of believing and prophesying, and not part with it upon a worse merchandise and exchange than Esau made for his birthright."

Such I will not say were the opinions, but the arguments, of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Permit me to add a few extracts from the "Collection of Articles," &c. to which I have already referred. The full title is the following: "A Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, with other Public Records of the Church of England, chiefly in the times of K. Edward VI., Q. Elizabeth, K. James, and K. Charles I.; published to vindicate the Church of England, and to promote Uniformity and Peace in the same." There is no recognition of tradition in this Collection, but of the Scriptures alone, as the only "*foundation* and *pillar* of the faith";

of our church. Tradition is wholly an exotic—a plant which in our church has never been "catalogued;" and I hope that every attempt to transplant it from the Roman soil will ever be resisted by the genuine sons of the Protestant Church of England. The following passages are taken from documents not generally known; and they refer us constantly to Scripture, and not at all to tradition.

"They (the clergy) shall purely and sincerely declare the Word of God; and in the same exhort their hearers to works of faith, mercy, and charity, specially prescribed and commanded in Scripture; and that works devised by men's phantasies besides Scripture .... have not only no promise of reward in Scripture for doing of them; but contrariwise, great threats and maledictions of God."—*Injunctions* by King Edward VI., 1547, p. 2.

"The said ecclesiastical person shall in no wise, at any unlawful time, nor for any other cause, but for their honest necessity, haunt or resort to any taverns or ale-houses. And after their dinner or supper, they shall not give themselves to drinking or riot, spending their time idly by day or by night, at dice, cards, or tables playing, or any other unlawful game; but at all times, as they shall have leisure, they shall hear and read somewhat of Holy Scripture."—Ibid. p. 4.

"Whether they have preached, or caused to be preached, purely and sincerely, the Word of God, in every of their cures, every quarter of the year, once at least, exhorting their parishioners to works commanded by the Scripture, and not to works devised by men's phantasies besides Scripture, as wearing or praying upon beads or such like."—*Articles of Visitation* by Archbishop Cranmer, in the second year of Edward VI., p. 26.

"Whether they have discouraged any person from reading of any part of the Bible, either in Latin or in English; but rather comforted and exhorted every person to read the same, as the very lively Word of God, and the special food of man's soul."—Ibid. p. 26.

"Whether any have wilfully maintained and defended any heresies, errors, or false opinions contrary to the faith of Christ and Holy Scripture."—Ibid. p. 31.

I may here introduce what occurs in the Articles of Visitation, by Ridley, Bishop of London, in the fourth year of King Edward VI., 1550, as it bears on a subject mooted by the Oxford Tracts men. It is respecting sin after baptism. Their view was evidently considered false and dangerous, otherwise the following inquiry would not have been made in the Articles of Visitation:—

"Whether any saith, that Christian men cannot be allowed to repentance, if they sin voluntary after baptism." p. 37.

"They (the clergy) shall discourage no man from the reading any part of the Bible, either in Latin or in English, but shall rather exhort *every person* to read the same with great humility and reverence, as the very lively word of God and the especial food of man's soul, which *all Christian persons* are bound to embrace, believe, and follow, if they look to be saved."—*Injunctions* by Queen Elizabeth, 1559, p. 69.

"That the vice of damnable despair may be clearly taken away, and that firm belief and stedfast hope may be surely conceived of all their parishioners, being in any danger, they shall learn, and have always in a readiness, such comfortable places and sentences of *Scripture* as do set forth the mercy, benefits, and goodness, of Almighty God towards all penitent and believing persons, that they may at all times, when necessity shall require, promptly comfort their flock with the lively word of God, which is the only stay of man's conscience."—Ibid. p. 72.

There is not a word in these extracts, nor in the documents from which they are taken, about tradition, or the Catholic truth, or the consent of Fathers, but the Scriptures are made every thing both to the clergy and laity; the clergy are to preach the word of God (and *not* what is called the catholic faith) purely and sincerely, and *all* the people are to read it humbly and reverently. What an omission, if tradition is a guide as well as Scripture!

The Articles drawn up in King Edward VI.'s reign, in the year 1552—and afterwards ratified, with some few alterations, in 1571—are essentially the same with our present Articles. And we know

that in the Articles there is not one single reference to the Catholic truth or tradition; but the Scripture is continually appealed to as the only repository and standard of truth, to which not only the doctrines, but the ceremonies and the traditions of the Church, as to forms and discipline, are to be made conformable. There is not a single mention made of tradition as to doctrine, or of Catholic truth, or consent of Fathers or the primitive Church. There is nothing acknowledged, or even referred to, as "the foundation and pillar of faith," but the written word of God. And yet it seems that tradition is a guide to our Church as well as Scripture! It is a guide which she has never recognized; and which, I trust, she will never recognize; for it is a blind one, and will surely lead her into the ditch of error and corruption.

The Canons were first drawn up in the reign of James I., in the year 1603. In these, again, we meet with no recognition of tradition or the Catholic truth, or the primitive church, except in a few rituals respecting the ordination of ministers and the sign of the cross in baptism. On the last subject are the strongest expressions—"Freti orthodoxis iis doctrinæ regulis, de mediis et adiaphoris, quas Divino Canoni ac Patrum antiquorum concordi sententiæ judicamus esse consentaneas." Thus they speak of themselves as "relying on those orthodox rules of doctrine, as to middle and indifferent things, which we judge to be agreeable to the Divine Canon and to the concurrent opinion of the ancient Fathers." Now if they relied on the same respecting doctrines of faith, we might expect the same sort of statement; but we find it no where among the documents of our Church; but her invariable language is, that she relies, in this respect, solely and exclusively on Scripture.

ANTI-PAPIST.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION:—WORDLY HABITS; WORKS OF FICTION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

A CORRESPONDENT in your last Number, in proposing the renewed discussion in your pages of various subjects, which were largely considered therein in your earlier volumes, but with adaptation to new readers and altered times, mentions the question of written and extempore preaching. Without overlooking the importance of that question—for I believe that the Church of England loses much from its clergy not being sufficiently accustomed to unwritten public speaking—I would propose a few other subjects which well deserve renewed attention. One is, historical and doctrinal memorials of the English Reformation, with notices of the lives and writings of our venerated reformers and martyrs. Another is, education, with especial reference to the circumstances of religious families. Another is, the line of conduct which ought to be pursued by young persons of piety, who are under the authority of wordly-minded parents or guardians; for sometimes duties appear to clash. Another is, the Scriptural application of the general precept, to come out of the world and to be separate, to the circumstances of an age like the present, in which religious profession widely abounds, and the broad line of demarcation between the true disciples of Christ and the children of this world

seems shaded off on either side to the public eye—for God only can read the heart—by too much laxity on the one side, while there is often increased decorum, including perhaps not only regular church-going, but even family prayer, on the other.

But if I might suggest a subject of this kind which calls for anxious consideration, it is that of *baneful reading*. To those who consider what were the general feelings and habits of the faithful servants of God in former years, it sounds strangely to hear the young persons in religious families discussing the merits of the poems (I do not mean the grossest) of Lord Byron; or the novels of Sir Walter Scott; or the excellencies and defects of public singers and theatrical music;—for though they do not go to the opera, they seem to consider it no offence to bring its words and its airs to their own fire-sides. I feel persuaded that alarming mischief is going on in these respects; and that, as much of wealth, and rank, and talent, are becoming increasingly consecrated to the service of God, the enemy of souls is taking advantage of the extension of religious profession to break down the barriers which Eternal Wisdom has set up between his vineyard and the wilderness of the world; and to fill up or bridge over the fathomless gulf which separates the kingdom of Satan from that of "God's dear Son." I am quite aware that to intelligent young persons, when thrown into circles of wordly-minded, though not indecorous, society, it is embarrassing to have no common topics, and not to have read or heard of the popular books of the day, as they are passing through families and reading-societies. But why should Christians be ashamed to be ignorant from principle of what a man busily engaged in secular affairs is not ashamed to be ignorant of from necessity? "I never had a volume of Mr. Bulwer's in my hands in my life," said a gentleman of high reading and attainments, but whose time all persons present admitted to be too valuable to be spent in frivolous pursuits. Contrast this remark with the previous conversation of a young gentleman, the son of a clergyman, who seemed bent upon shewing the company that neither studious pursuits, for he was a fair scholar, nor "a proper attention to religion," for he was no profligate, was incompatible with "keeping up one's knowledge of the popular literature of the day." I remember, Mr. Observer, fighting your battle last year with some friends who had been laughing at the good taste of the Southampton dissenting book society in discarding your work, and taking in the Pickwick Papers. "I do not wish," said Mr. ——, "the Christian Observer reviewers to give us the beauties of Pickwick, as the Quarterly did; but they might have reviewed Sergeant Talfourd's tragedy of Ion; and there the Dissenters evinced better taste and greater largeness of mind than their brethren of the Church, for they publicly acted it at their evangelical grammar school at Mill Hill." My reply was, that if a religious magazine brings "the beauties" of Ion into my family, my sons and daughters and visitors will probably be so enraptured with them, that they will wish to procure the tragedy itself. I take for granted—for I have not read it—that there is nothing immoral in the learned Sergeant's composition; but it is a modern play, which is being acted at Drury Lane, or Covent Garden, or some such place, amidst the avowed associations of wordliness, and the too frequent, if not inevitable, profligacies which render a theatre a pest-house and an awful snare to souls. How are my servants, when they see Ion upon my table, to make a distinction between the announcement on its

title page, and that on the grosser productions of the modern stage. Consider the danger of the example to them; consider also the peril to my children and friends, if I once break down the distinction which ought to exist in Christian families, between profitable and injurious reading; and open the way for the introduction of other theatrical publications, and excite a taste for hearing about plays and actors. Could I be justified in incurring this risk? to say nothing of the general question, which I admit is fairly open to discussion, of the due limits and extent of reading works of fiction in Christian families.

But intending to enumerate only a few subjects of inquiry, I find myself trespassing upon your pages, which many other of your correspondents could occupy to greater advantage; I therefore leave the matter in their hands; only let us remember whose servants we are, and decide, as in His sight, what his service demands.

PRISCUS.

REMARKS ON DR. PUSEY'S ACCOUNT OF INNOVATIONS AT OXFORD.

For the Christian Observer.

WE alluded, in the Answers to Correspondents in our last Number, to a letter of Dr. Pusey's upon "innovations attributed to clergymen in or near Oxford." Dr. Pusey opens the question as follows:—

"*To the Rev. G. Townsend.*

"My dear Sir,—A portion of your late charge has been supposed to be founded on reports circulated about some of the Oxford Clergy, and to allude to them: it was not worth while to notice them, stated as they were: it is different when commented upon by one in local authority. For the responsibility belonging both to the office and the occasion gives them a character which they had not before. The passage in your charge is thus reported—

"'With regard to the first of these (the duties connected with the rubric), I have heard with surprise and grief that several of our brethren in the south, believing themselves to be justified by the customs of a primitive antiquity, have lately made alterations which must, by the people of their congregations, be regarded as innovations, and which have begun a new era of observances of very questionable utility in the Church. Some have added to the surplice a peculiar kind of cross; others have placed the bread and wine on a small additional table near the Lord's table, or altar; others have introduced needless bowings and unusual attitudes of devotion.'

"The charges then supposed to allude to the Oxford Clergy are—1. That they have set up their notions of primitive antiquity against the rubrics of their own church; 2. that they have introduced what their congregations must look upon as innovations; and, as instances of these, have, 3. added a cross to the surplice; 4. placed the bread and wine on a small additional table; 5. introduced needless bowings, and, 6. unusual attitudes of devotion."

Dr. Pusey proceeds to discuss these six points; and having done so, sums up the whole matter thus:

"And now let me just recapitulate what it is which has been thus blazoned about and exaggerated: *one* clergman has worn a cross upon his scarf, in compliance, as he thought, with our rubric; two clergymen have, in new congregations, knelt towards the east, in conformity with the ancient, and recent, and still existing practice of our Church; two have used a table, where the rubric implies that the elements must be placed somewhere, but says not how. Strong party spirit has taken up these reports, not for their own sake (else why do they pass unnoticed irregular innovations in the mode of administering the communion or baptism?) but because it was easier so to cast a slur upon a body of men, and, through them, upon sound principles, than to refute them."

This statement appeared so satisfactory to Mr. Townsend, that he

wrote to Dr. Pusey, in reply—"The authorities on which I depended, and the exaggerated reports I heard, certainly misled me. The evils of which I believed the Church had reason to complain, were much misrepresented to me, and on that misrepresentation I acted."

The "authorities" which thus "misled" Mr. Townsend, are stated to be Mr. Maurice's publication, entitled "Popery at Oxford," the Christian Observer, and "private information." We know nothing of Mr. Townsend's sources of private information; nor have we any thing to do with Mr. Maurice's pamphlet, which we never gave an opinion upon; and the correspondent who sent us some passages from it in our Number for last August, stated that he did not approve of the manner in which it is written; though the facts alleged in it, he thought, deserved serious consideration. We are not, however, sure that we have not done Mr. Maurice some injustice by our silence; for, whatever may be his style, Dr. Pusey has not, so far as we are aware, disproved his facts. But for ourselves, not only has not Dr. Pusey confuted any of our statements, but so far as his remarks bear upon our observations, they corroborate all that we asserted, as we are prepared to demonstrate.

Dr. Pusey having succeeded in convincing Mr. Townsend that he had been "misled," and wishing to disabuse others also, sent a copy of his letter to the British Magazine, together with Mr. Townsend's statement. It might have been more useful to have applied the antidote in the Christian Observer, where the bane had been administered, rather than to the uninfected; and we assure Dr. Pusey that his paper should have been faithfully inserted, though we will not say in the manner which Mr. Newman wished to prescribe, without correction or refutation, as it appears in the British Magazine. Our readers will have seen, from the Answers to Correspondents in our last Number, how needful such correction was; for upon our writing to Mr. Townsend for an explanation of what regarded ourselves, he with great candour and kindness favoured us with a statement which proved that our supposed misleading was no misleading at all; and in answer to our request that he would point out any passage which he deemed to be erroneous, he explicitly said, "I cannot mention one." He had thought, indeed, that one of our statements implied a wider extension of the evil than Dr. Pusey admits; but we shewed that our reference was general, whereas Dr. Pusey's answer applied only to the locality of Oxford, though even in that limited range our phrase, "certain divines," was perfectly correct upon Dr. Pusey's own shewing.

If our readers will look back to Dr. Pusey's statement above quoted, they will see that it is limited, first, to Mr. Townsend's charges; and, secondly, to "the Oxford Clergy." But Mr. Townsend's charges do not take in the whole case; so that a reply to these, even if sufficient so far as it went, would still leave much unreplied to: but the reply is not sufficient even to these; for Mr. Townsend said, "several of our brethren in the south;" whereas Dr. Pusey confines his answers to "the Oxford Clergy," which excludes Mr. Keble himself, in Hampshire, and others whom we could mention; nay, even Mr. Townsend's own larger phrase of "brethren of the south" is not, we fear, coextensive with these innovations.

Mark Dr. Pusey's mode of defence. He says, "Let me just recapitulate what it is which has been thus blazoned about and exaggerated;" and then he states, as the sum, that one clergyman has worn a cross upon his scarf; two have officiated with their backs to the people and

their faces to the east; and two have introduced a side table, subsidiary to the "altar." In this statement he seems to represent the innovations as not worth notice, on account of their being confined to a few individuals. But upon his principles, this is not a right way of treating the matter. If, indeed, he told us that he considered the Oxford doings as mere private whimsies which it were wisest to pass over in silence, in order not to make the innovators and their practices of too much importance, there would be some reason in his argument; but it is rather extraordinary to wish to repress our vigilance by treating the innovations as the act of only a few individuals, and yet giving us the strongest reasons he can think of to justify them. If he said that he was opposed to the innovations—that he thought them highly improper—we might feel inclined to consider whether the measure of their extension rendered it worth while to say much about them. But when he palliates them and pleads for them, he has no right to tell us of exaggeration as to the number of the offenders; for if his arguments are sound, the few ought to be the many, and, supported by such authority, may soon become so. But if the principle be wrong, it is not rendered right by the paucity of the converts. Besides, who are these five clergyman, and what are the trifles in which they have innovated? They belong to a body of persons, some of them in high stations in the University of Oxford, who exert a powerful influence, and profess to be the only sound expositors of Anglican doctrine and discipline; and who, besides their well-combined efforts in sermons, magazines, newspapers, and volumes, publish every month treatises addressed to the public, to the clergy, and to the schools, connecting their lucubrations with "the academical year," which may lead the unwary reader to suppose that they emanate officially from the university from which they are dated; and who moreover assert that their opinions are taking such deep root, and are spreading so widely throughout the land, that they will soon triumph over what they call rationalistic-spiritualism, as distinguished from mysterious Bellarmine opus-operatum sacramental influence. Is it, we would ask, fair to attempt to quiet the apprehensions which Mr. Townsend's remarks must justly have excited, by talking of five individuals, as if these were all; whereas these five are only a specimen of what they themselves state to be a large body, which is ramifying itself throughout the kingdom? or is it fair to attempt to lull the public anxiety by adducing the mere personal numeral of Oxford innovation, whereas the very point of the argument is the place, the countenance, the authority, the example, the irradiating emanation? for what would Dr. Pusey himself say, if, when some of the young men recent from Oxford were describing the ceremonials which they intended to carry into their parishes, as they had seen them practised, on what they considered high authority, at the church of St. Mary the Virgin, the University church, we had resorted to the numerical argument, and replied, "Oh, it is only one Mr. Newman." We should have been told that one Mr. Newman, thus situated, thus supported, thus unchecked by academical or episcopal authority, is a host in himself; and that if right he ought to be imitated, if wrong to be officially admonished. We should say this, even if there were but one Mr. Newman, and if Oxford, instead of being the focus, were the whole sphere of the exceptionable principles and practices, which unhappily it is not.

Again, as Dr. Pusey's extenuation from the paucity of numbers is

unfair, so also is his argument from the alleged slightness of the innovations. We have said, not once but many times, in the course of these discussions, that we felt it to be a vexatious and humiliating task to be arguing about rites, vestments, and ceremonials, which are not intrinsically worth the paper wasted upon them, but which are of great moment as connected with matters of doctrine, and as the visible exponents of controverted opinions. Dr. Pusey himself, when he is pressing another point, shews, that though one part of his argument made it necessary to represent his opponents as urging frivolous personal charges, another, somewhat suicidally, required him to assert that the innovating practices are alluded to for the sake of important doctrinal matters with which they are connected. "Strong party-spirit," he says, "has taken up these reports, not for their own sake, ... but because it is easier to cast a slur upon a body of men, and through them *upon sound principles*, than to refute them." Does then he really mean that it is "a slur" upon Mr. Newman to say, that in officiating in Divine worship he kneels with his back to the congregation, instead of praying with them as their Protestant pastor in the reading-desk? What right has he to accuse his opponents of casting a slur, when they are only correctly stating facts? If there is any slurring, it is Mr. Newman who slurs himself. Dr. Pusey, even while he thus accuses his opponents of slurring individuals, incidentally admits two points which set aside his whole argument; first, that the personal reference is only with a view to those "sound principles," as he considers them, which are connected with the particular usage; and secondly, that while he represents his opponents as attacking the proceedings of *vel duo vel nemo*, a matter not worth noticing, the real defendants are "a body of men" who, united in close compact, are endeavouring to extend throughout the land those opinions of which the practices at Oxford are visible exponents.

Dr. Pusey says that the opposers of the innovations at Oxford must be actuated by "strong party spirit," "lese why do they pass unnoticed irregular innovations in the mode of administering the communion or baptism?" We are not aware what are the innovations to which he alludes; but if he will point out any, he may rest assured that we have none of the party-spirit which would prevent our censuring them; measuring, however, the censure, as we do in the case of the Oxford practices, rather by the principle than by the overt act. It has been the custom in many large parishes, for perhaps a century or more, to abridge the baptismal service, though far less commonly, we believe, by those divines "of a certain class" to whom the Oxford Tracts so contemptuously allude, than by some of their brethren. Now we object to the abridgment altogether; but we should apply a different class of arguments to omissions which had become common, from considerations that involve no setting up of a principle, and those which were avowedly intended to be symbolical. And so again in the case of the Holy Communion. It is customary in many parishes to use two cups where the number of communicants is large, and the plural form of address is consequently employed instead of the singular. The practice is not, in our opinion, strictly rubrical; but it is not intended to be significative of any litigated doctrine; it is not meant, for instance, to imply that the administrator is so hyper-Calvinistic that he cannot address each individual as interested in the atonement. The writer of these remarks was once walking home wit the late

Bishop Burgess from a chapel where an elderly clergyman, in administering the Lord's Supper to a large number of communicants, had taken them by groups of three or four at a time. The Bishop remarked that he did not like the custom, but he saw no help for it; it appeared necessary, and necessity was a law which superseded many others. We are not arguing for the practice, but merely shewing the difference between that which is meant to involve a principle and that which is not. We suppose that no clergyman intends to declare that he thinks he has a right to violate rubrics at his will. Our argument, in regard to the practices at Oxford, is precisely Dr. Pusey's own—namely, that they are connected with what he considers "sound principles," but which we consider unsound ones. Ceremonials of no great moment perhaps, in themselves, may be so introduced as to give a wrong colour to the principles of the Anglican Church.

And here we may exchange a word with a popular northern conservative—Blackwood—who is pleased to scoff as follows:—

"A correspondence has grown up between Mr. Townsend and the Tracts for the Times people of Oxford. Where are our prelates when this nonsense is going on in the heart of the great Protestant University? The questions in debate now are, whether men shall turn their heads to the east, or to some other quarter of the compass, during the reading of the creeds. Whether the clergy shall wear little crosses on the tips of their scarves? Whether they shall put the bread and wine on the table in the chancel with their own hands, or by the hands of the churchwarden? Whether they shall put them primarily on a little table apart, or in a recess in the wall? Whether they shall make a bow to them, as they advance to the table, or omit that piece of politeness? Mr. Townsend, it seems, had said, cursorily, that all those tricks savoured of Popery! Dr. Pusey, for it is no less than the Hebrew Professor and Canon of Christ Church who feels aggrieved, proceeds formally to vindicate the orthodoxy of those prodigiously childish persons who think that they are thus actually restoring the purity of the Church. Hume, in his history, observes, with keen and due contempt, 'that the most furious quarrels of the sectaries were about surplices, rails to the communion-table, the position of the reading-desks, and such other trivialities.' And are we to have all this nonsense renewed, and solemn men, in doctors' hoods, thinking that they are not committing the most arrant foolery by scribbling either for or against them? and all this frippery when the very existence of the Church is at hazard—when a rabble of legislators in the streets are howling for her plunder, and Popery, like a wild beast, is foaming at her threshold? Let Oxford bestir herself while she remains a University; leave those pompous triflers to their obscure squabbles; and add something manly, honest, and rational, to the national defence of Christianity."

We said, months ago, that Lauds will always generate Prynnes; ceremonialists, iconoclasts; and Popish mummery, either superstitious doting or irreverent scoffing; and here is a proof of it. The Oxford Tract divines seem to think that because we live in an age which abhors mysticism, it is peculiarly necessary to affect as much of it as possible; and to endeavour to correct unceremoniousness by an overwrought addiction to formality. They hope to impress the world with reverence, whereas they are producing the very opposite effect. Even what is decent they overstrain till they cause a revulsion; and Blackwood's scoffs shew how little we can expect to gain when we have to defend by argument a custom which is impressive only from usage. The northern satirist is, however, quite wrong in supposing that the debate concerns only trifles, for nothing is a trifle which involves a serious principle. He may flippantly call it a quarrel about "a piece of politeness," whether we shall "make a bow," as he phrases it, to the bread and wine; but the practice symbolically involves the question whether they are *only* bread and wine, or whether they are so transubstantiated or consubstantiated, that according to Dr. Hook

Christ's body may be burned in a fire, and his blood poured out upon a consecrated pavement. Dr. Pusey, in this very letter, defends the practice of "bowing to the altar on leaving the choir," as it has been the custom, he says, "from time immemorial" for the dean and canons to do in the cathedral of Christ Church, Oxford. Now here is just one of those customs which explains the principle which we are considering. In the days of Popery in England, every person, upon entering a church or quitting it, bowed to the altar, as is done still in Romanist churches, and the action was significant; but it became incongruous and improper when Protestantism was established and "altars" were abolished; for it sounds strangely, to speak of bowing to a "table;" the only word which our canons and rubrics apply to what Dr. Pusey still *significantly*, and not merely by allowable accommodation, calls an "altar." But customs existing "from time immemorial" are not easily broken through; and, accordingly, to this hour, in many country parishes, the labouring portion of the peasantry, in going in and out of church, bow or courtesy, either from mere habit, without any meaning, or, as we have very frequently heard them say, as a mark of respect to the clergyman; and, in point of fact, the old obeisance to the altar is very generally converted into an obeisance towards the reading-desk or clergyman's pew. At best, or at worst, it is only a customary mark of reverence upon entering a place dedicated to the service of God; and no man needs be very anxious to trouble himself either for or against it, so long as it is not connected, as in the Church of Rome, with any mystery or superstition; but if the Oxford Tract writers come to make such customs once more symbolical, and attach much importance to them as involving "sound principles," Lauds, as we have said, will generate Prynnes; and some even of the decent observances of the Church of England itself may be subjected to popular opprobrium. At the cathedral of Oxford the obeisance to the altar was not kept up by mere habit, as in country parishes: it meant something; and though it was probably dropped, or only observed unostentatiously by individuals, in the days of Edward VI., and perhaps of Elizabeth and James, yet there was always a class of divines who affected the old habits, and by their means a few ceremonials were kept up, which some of their neighbours submitted to as not attaching much importance either to their breach or their observance. We may safely say that his present Grace of Canterbury, when he was at Christ Church, did not mean to assert by the customary bow the peculiar doctrines which the Oxford Tracts are seeking to embody in such observances. We have known many conscientious undergraduates in various colleges, ask their companions or seniors why they were to bow to the East at leaving the college chapel, and the answer has usually been that it was a custom "from time immemorial," a decent mark of reverence; and thus it passed as a ceremony harmless though not very important. But if it is to imply that the communion-table is an altar, and that, as Archbishop Laud expressed it, "the altar is the greatest place of God's residence upon earth," "the throne where His Body is present," so that "idolatry it is not to worship towards his holy table," then it comes to be a question of conscience whether the customary homage can be lawfully complied with. The obeisance at the name of Jesus in the creed, whether turning to the East or not, is prescribed by the canons, and involves no superstition; but to bow going in or out of a place of

worship, on the ground that "the altar" is "God's residence upon earth," "the throne where His Body is present," is so thoroughly Romish and superstitious that it ought to be forthwith relinquished. We can give to the custom an innocent, nay reverent, exposition; and therefore, though its origin is Popish, we may tolerate it thus duly Protestantized; but once make it superstitiously symbolical, and it ceases to be a matter of indifference. Dr. Pusey poperizes the ceremony even more than Archbishop Laud; for the latter says only "worshipping *towards*," but the former "bowing *to*." Let it be distinctly understood that Dr. Pusey asserts that the dean and canons of Oxford, not only bow down "towards," but emphatically "*to*," what he calls an "altar." Laud well knew that the distinction is important, the Romanist contending that it is not idolatry to "bow down or worship" *towards* or *before* an altar, or image, or relic; though it would be so to bow down *to* the material symbol. Will the various colleges and cathedrals which keep up the custom be bound by Dr. Pusey's exposition of it? Will they consent to admit, that instead of bowing "towards" the East, in remembrance of the Sun of Righteousness, they are bowing "to" a table, the work of men's hands?

So far we have been arguing upon general principles; but as Dr. Pusey has given six specific heads of fact, it might be thought that we avoided his arguments if we did not glance at them. We cannot, however, consent to devote a larger space to so unedifying a discussion in our present Number, but we intend to resume it in our next, and to shew that Dr. Pusey's explanation is altogether unsatisfactory, and confirms, instead of disproving, the statements which it is intended to refute.

(*To be continued.*)

DESULTORY THOUGHTS ON RELIGIOUS POETRY.

(*Continued from p.* 37.)

IT matters little what peg one hangs a note upon, if the note be worth hanging, and the peg strong enough to bear it. While penning the desultory thoughts on religious poetry in the former part of my paper, I was reminded of a little volume of poems by a lady, from the Irish press, entitled "Home," which is so germane to my remarks, that I will adopt it as the text for a few further observations. You quoted some passages from it among your occasional poetical extracts from new works; but to myself it was already well known.

In following up the reflections in the preceding part of my paper, I was led to contrast two death scenes; one in this little volume, the other, that so graphically and feelingly depicted by Lord Byron—Conrad by the couch of Medora—which the former suggested to my memory. The contrast of character is indeed palpable; but these two scenes do not furnish the least illustration of my theory, for this reason, that the wide difference of principle in the authors sufficiently accounts for the morbid gloom of the one scene, and the healthful activity of feeling in the other. It is where the principles, circumstances, and other general features, closely resemble each other, that we are forced to ask, How is it, that as if by a spiritual tact—an intuitive perception, such as eye or tone supplies—we catch from the

written page the shades of character, feeling, and spirit of the author? And still more, How is it that a few simple words, like the bold touches of a master's pencil, flash in a moment upon our view the whole feeling or the whole character?

I do not surely mean to compare the poetical powers of the author of "Home" with those of that perverted master-spirit to whom the arcana of the natural heart seemed thrown open, and by a volition of whose mind all its hidden emotions could be evoked and rendered visible. And much less should I select for such comparison one of his most pathetic and exquisitely finished scenes. But the fact is, that the one scene recalled the other to my memory, and I was then forcibly struck by the contrast in their characters. And I do say, that to me—and I doubt not to every well ordered mind, which prefers the healthful play of regulated feelings to the tempestuous, desolating rush of *one* absorbing and ungoverned passion; and still more, which loves to see the power and promises of the Gospel practically exemplified—the contrast is peculiarly refreshing between the dense and deepening gloom of the one scene, and the dawning light of support and cheerfulness which, even at its darkest moments, breaks in upon the other. The one scene presents an awful uniformity of aspect, as if nature had reached a full and final pause: it is darkness palpable—a dense gloom, uncheered, impenetrable by a single ray of consolation:

> "The sun goes forth, but Conrad's day is dim;
> And the night cometh, ne'er to pass from him."

He stands by that bed of death, in the awful quietude of self-dependence—as if, transfixed by the lightning's flash, the current of life had suddenly stopped: but, as if ready to precipitate himself in overwhelming ruin upon the being who had dared even to breathe the thought of comfort or resignation,

> "He turned not, spoke not, sunk not. Fixed his look,
> And set the anxious frame that lately shook.
> He gazed——"

as if that he might take his fill of the luxury of despair, and drink to the very dregs the cup of misery which Providence had forced upon him. "He spoke not." And who would dare to break that awful silence? Who would dare to look down into the gloomy abysses, the volcanic heavings of that cleft heart? He disappears! Is it to go down into the blackness of darkness for ever? or is it to emerge from this bursting wave a shivered wreck—

> "In helpless, hopeless brokenness of heart."

In the energy of despair he survives the shock, and re-appears a dark and fearful man, without sympathies of joy or sorrow: the last link which bound him to his species rent; and his withered soul, untameable as the tempest-tossed ocean—its congenial abode—in the stern and sullen defiance of despair, daring the Omnipotent to level against it his hottest thunderbolts, and to vex it with all his storms. In the other scene, too, there is indeed the darkness of sorrow; but

> "—— the good explore,
> For peace, those realms where guilt can never soar."

The voice of subdued and softened penitence, of hopeful prayer, ascends: the cloud soon bursts in refreshing showers. the cheerful sun breaks through, and the bow of mercy appears. The mourner passes through the furnace of his trial, his heart mellowed, sanctified,

and renewed; and with increased tenderness of sympathy for his suffering fellows—

> "Taught by that power which pitied him,
> He learns to pity them."

The author of the little volume before me has judiciously selected its subject. Its very title at once introduces the volume to the heart of every reader; for who does not love "Home?" Amid the infinite variety of disposition, taste, and habit, home possesses an universal charm, which enlivens for each what to others were the dullest scene, and sheds a light beneath which the dreariest landscape brightens into beauty. But when the mountain solitudes of cloud-capped Marynton, and Tuck with turbaned brow, and Mucruss with its dim aisles and silent cloisters and ancient sepulchres; when the lakes studded with emerald islets, girt with waving woods and grotesque rocks, and musical with the harmonious concert of thundering waterfalls, and babbling rills, and the responding tones of echo; when Dunlo and the Reeks, the heath-encircled tower of Aghadoe (once a cathedral), and the verdant isle of Innisfallen, are among the landscape features of "home," "the harp of Innisfail" must indeed "wake *alone* to tones of sadness," if a theme so sweet and objects so cheering can elicit no pleasant sounds. It is not from any defect of its subject or material if this little volume does not furnish to its readers a rich repast.

But still they are not the natural features of the landscape, however sublime and beautiful, which impart to home its peculiar and indescribable charm: these are but partial ingredients in the formation of those varied emotions which home concentrates, but they are powerful ingredients; and when Providence permits—when the choice is in other respects free—parents, in selecting a home, should, I have often thought, attach more importance than is usually done to the character of the natural scenery, as part of the apparatus for developing and training the youthful mind.

Still, home less receives from than imparts its charm to the natural landscape. Fancy can cull, to ornament and charm the heart parterre of home, the wild flowers of the mountain and the mosses of the moor. The cottage hearth, with all its simple associations, can, equally with the sumptuous palace and wide extended demesne, bind the heart to home with that powerful and peculiar affection which

> "——— drags at each remove a lengthening chain."

The sports and companions of childhood, the novel charms of an untried world, where every object is a spectacle of surprise and delight; the youthful feelings, tender as the opening bud, and robed in all the freshness and verdure of spring; the buoyant animal spirits of that jocund season, when to live is to enjoy; as life progresses, the identity of interests, the similarity of tastes and pursuits, the commerce of affections, the sympathy of joys and sorrows, those infinite affections and emotions which expand, and flourish, and fructify at home, as their congenial soil and climate, and which lay up their choicest fruits in its storehouses of memory—these are the chief elements of those mixed emotions which home concentrates, and which invest it with its peculiar charm.

But there are saddening recollections, too, associated with home. Home, viewed through the dark and ever lengthening vista of time, assumes a sombre aspect, deepening into gloom. Its frail walls sur-

vive its still more fragile inmates; and each departing year robs it of some cherished object. To the stranger's eye, indeed, the scene is full and cheerful as before; but to the practised eye of affection it is filled, not with early friends and loved companions, but with the shadows of the departed; and if we by time are "spared a little longer," we must stand as the withered trunk, all whose

"——— lovely companions are faded and gone,"—

each, in his respective home, the time-bleached and tottering monument of a buried generation. In truth these are gloomy and bitter reflections to *him* who has no home beyond the skies: and who knows not, for himself and for those whom he loves in Christ, "that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens?" For a home of durable and unalloyed happiness,

"He builds too low, who builds beneath the skies."

And often have I asked myself, in wonder, what that indurating process can be with which the world steels the hearts of its votaries against the lacerating and maddening influences of natural affection. Christianity alone can soften without enervating, and nerve without hardening, the heart: Christianity alone can preserve the tender feelings of youth in youthful freshness, sheltered from the withering breath of time, and the blunting collision of the world, to bring forth fruit in old age. It is not the meekness of piety, but the stoicism and apathy of worldliness, which pours a healing balm into the wound which the opening tomb inflicts upon many a mourner's desolated heart. If man were true to his nature, the death of his idols, the rending of the tenderest ties of affection, would and *ought* to inflict upon his heart an incurable wound, until either God had specially revealed to him, that the love of Christ was to be, not only a consoling and compensating, but also an exclusively absorbing affection; or if, as I believe, this is not the case, till

"——— deep internal evidence was given,
That parted friends should be restored in heaven."

But some amiable, and even pious, people seem to doubt the mutual recognition of friends in the life to come. I say *seem* to doubt, for I have often thought it a strong proof of that awful self-deception of which the human mind is capable, when I have heard those who with full conviction believe in the immortality of the soul, calmly expressing a doubt whether we must not part for ever at the grave with the objects of most fondly cherished affection. But let the physician, at that moment, declare that one of these idols is developing the seeds of lingering but incurable disease, and he would plunge them into the deepest abysses of wretchedness. Is not this the conduct of one whose faith is clouded, or dim sighted in discerning the reality or the duration of eternity; and who, whatever he may profess, practically prefers a little longer present possession to a reversionary title for ever? Could a consciously immortal being, and in a known state of probation, all whose circumstances tell upon his eternal destiny, thus intensely love, and adhesively cling to, in time, and thus passively resign, for eternity, his most cherished objects and affections? No. A little more of that faith which is the evidence of things not seen, which breaks down the wall of partition and opens time upon eternity, would soon teach men that much of their fortitude, and resignation, and acquiescence in the arrangements, real or fancied, of Providence,

was only because they closed their eyes against the fearful object, and never dared to "sit down and count the cost." And hence it is that we daily find men, to the deep depression of more practical minds, freely assenting to theories, because mere theories, and contemplated solely in an intellectual point of view, which we but too plainly see it were agony to them to reduce into practice, or to render the subjects of a real experience of the heart.

Scripture, as I interpret it in various passages (I hope none of your readers will say into Popery), directly asserts the mutual recognition of friends in the life to come: and the exercise of the natural affections, as the Divinely appointed apparatus of moral discipline in our probationary state, necessarily, as I conceive, implies it. Nor can I understand the experience, in its bearing upon eternity, of those who, while they deny, or even doubt, this recognition in the future life, permit the development of the human affections in the present. The eremite and ascetic alone, rationally and consistently follow out this chilling creed. Separate, by the mighty chasm which their view opens, eternity from time; deny that the human affections, when impregnated with the salt of holiness, and reduced in character, and in degree, to the standard of the Gospel, are to be perpetuated; and the development of their affections must become the source either of misery or of delusion.

A warm—but, I can testify, not exaggerated—eulogium on the much lamented IRWINE WHITTY, in the little volume before me, recalls an anecdote related to me on the spot of its occurrence—a cheerful Christian fireside. Your readers will not perhaps be displeased to add it to the interesting notices of this modern Irish martyr for Christ—for such was Archdeacon Whitty, as much as any victim of the Inquisition—in your volume for 1836, p. 420. The fourth night previous to his decease—in fact the night in which the murder would have been perpetrated, had he returned from Cashel towards his own home—Mr. Whitty passed beneath the hospitable roof of Mr. C—r, a neighbouring gentleman. In the course of the evening, sacred music was introduced; and Mr. Whitty heard, for the first time, and with deep impression, that beautiful and touching hymn, "Weep not for me." Again and again he requested that it might be played and sung; and when this amiable "home" circle was about to separate for the night, he requested again, in his playful manner, that it might be sung for him "once more." It was. The next music that burst upon his emancipated and enraptured soul was the anthem of welcome from the angelic choir, mingled with "Hosannah to the Lamb." And as I listened to this plaintive air and pathetic words—the prophetic funeral hymn of the departed—played and sung at the same "witching hour," and by the same choir, save one, reverence was mingled with pleasure. I thought that if departed spirits can take cognizance of scenes on earth, *that one*, perhaps, was not far distant; and that if the dull, cold ear of mortality were pervious to the finer tones of the spirits of the just made perfect, *that voice* might again be heard to mingle with this choir below. He who had taught many members of that "home," in a season of bereavement, to look upwards for consolation and support; and pointing from the bed of death to the many mansions of our Father's house, elevated their hearts with the reflection, "He is not here, he is risen;"—he who, diverting their view from the dark days of sorrowful separation, to the ever-rolling years of joyful and indissoluble reunion, taught them, in

the spirit of the Apostle, to "comfort one another with these words" —he too, no doubt, joined there in spirit with that choir of the Church below, which, not unmindful of this affecting incident, sang again, and with feeling of increased devotion from the reminiscence,

"When the spark of life is waning,
Weep not for me!
When the languid eye is straining,
Weep not for me!
When the feeble pulse is ceasing,
Start not at its swift decreasing,
'Tis the fettered soul's releasing,
Weep not for me!
When the pangs of death assail me,
Weep not for me!
Christ is mine—He cannot fail me—
Weep not for me!
Yes, though sin and doubt endeavour
From his love my soul to sever,
Jesus is my strength for ever—
Weep not for me!"

I have wandered from general thoughts on religious poetry to a passing notice of some of the topics suggested by a little volume of religious poems, but I may possibly resume the subject at some future time, not wishing to trespass too largely in the present paper.

J. M. H.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

For the Christian Observer.

PARTING AND FINDING.

THREE years hast thou been taken from my sight;
And not an hour has passed but I have thought
Of thee, and of thy sweetness, deeply wrought
In memory's loom, her theme by day and night;
And still that theme, like thee, the favourite.
And oft thy resting-place my heart hath sought,
And thither, dearest child, the fond wish brought,
To wait with thee in some fair sphere of light
Till God shall, one by one, my whole flock raise,
And all be gathered in that heavenly home,
To share joys brighter than of former days!
Oh, how will that high universal dome
Then ring with our united burst of praise
To Him who was, and is, and is to come! G.

"AND HE WAS TRANSFIGURED BEFORE THEM," &c.—(Matthew xvii.)

Is it an eastern morning's glory breaking,
Filling with light Judea's sacred sky,
When, the disciples in amazement waking,
The new-born radiance meets their dazzled eye?
No; 'tis the brighter Sun of Righteousness
That heaven with life and happiness doth bless.

And who are these that in communion holy,
Stand with their Lord upon the mountain-height?
Lo! they are saints, long perfect, once though lowly:
Through that atoning blood their robes are white,
Whose hour of shedding forth was drawing nigh—
Mysterious hour, of cross-stained Calvary!

What is their converse?—of foretold salvation,
And woes by Heaven's Anointed to be borne?
And was it of the ransom of each nation
That should behold, by faith, His cross and mourn?
Or waiting seraph hosts that burn above
To shout the triumph of his bleeding love?

Hark! from the cloud forth sounds the voice of glory—
Of Him no mortal doth behold and live!
Disciples bending list the hallowed story—
The Father to the Son doth witness give!
And now, the sacred vision past and gone,
On Tabor's mount the Saviour stands alone.

As when, to thy disciples bent in fear,
Entering the cloud of radiant light unknown,
In that last judgment when thou shalt appear,
Earth's trembling myriads gathered round thy throne;
Our hope of glory be that gracious word—
Arise, fear not! 'mid nature's ruin heard.

M. F.

"*There came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and she brake the box, and poured it upon his head.*"—Mark xiv. 3.

SHE wiped with the rich tresses of her hair
The dust-polluted feet of her dear Lord;
From her cold alabaster box she poured
The precious ointment that perfumed the air:
'Tis said the Jews possessed an unguent rare
Which they might only use in sacrifice;
And stored it was, and costly in its price;
Of this rich gum she surely did prepare
The sad anointing for the burying,
And thus a sacrificial offering bring.
Oh, blessed among women! when the word
Reached her sick heart, of her adoring Lord,
This work that she hath wrought on me shall prove,
Where'er the Gospel's preached, memorial of her love.

E. L. A.

"DURABLE RICHES."—(PROVERBS viii. 18.)

WHY is the diamond counted precious?
What charm does it disclose?
Say, doth its beauty so refresh us
As the bursting summer rose?

With soft breath the air perfuming,
Gemmed with dew-drops bright,
Now melting meek-eyed tints assuming,
Now flashing in the light;

Glittering in the sun's out-breaking
With rainbow gems of dew,
Full many a rival diamond making
As lustrous to the view.

Fair flower, why, brightest gems out-vying,
Less prized art thou than they?
Because thou art a creature dying,
A thing that must decay;

Because the beauty thee adorning
Quick passes from our sight;
Because thy bloom is of the morning,
But fadeth ere the night.

E. L. A.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FABER ON THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

(*Continued from p. 55.*)

We return with great satisfaction to our notice of this well-timed publication of a theological veteran whose works exhibit more of deep reading and recondite research than are often witnessed even in days of less superficial literature than the present. In the volumes of our former Series will be found reviews of Mr. Faber's most important publications. Our literary acquaintance with him commenced in our very first volume, in 1802, with a review of a sermon which he had preached before the University of Oxford, in defence of episcopal ordination, and in which he clearly proved that the power of ordination does not belong to presbyters, but is vested in the hands of bishops; while, at the same time, he exhorted his hearers "not to be hurried into the violent language of abuse and invective" against those who were censuring the orders of the Church of England; but rather to remember for themselves that "it will but little avail us in the great and terrible day of the Lord to have been members of perhaps the purest communion in the world, should we have sold ourselves during our state of probation in this life to work unrighteousness." Our high ecclesiastical privileges, he added, will be among our most formidable accusers. "At the era of the Reformation, God was pleased to preserve to us the original and most legitimate form of church government; and further to bless us with those impregnable bulwarks against heresy and innovation, our excellent Articles and Homilies; let us then see to it that we profit by these undeserved mercies; let us devote every faculty to the service of our blessed Lord; and let us strive to walk in that narrow path which alone terminates in everlasting felicity." We do not think the transcription of these admonitions is less seasonable at the commencement of our present than of our former series.

About the same period we reviewed our author's Bampton lectures, entitled Horæ Mosaicæ, and his learned Mysteries of the Cabiri; and in subsequent years his Calvinistic and Arminian controversy; his elaborate Dissertation on the Prophecies; his Treatise on the Holy Spirit; his Three Dispensations; and his Difficulties of Infidelity; besides which, various particulars in these and others of his works have been discussed from time to time by ourselves and our correspondents; and our readers are aware, for he affixed his name to his communications, that he has contributed very largely to many of our volumes, by disquistions upon prophecy and matters of biblical criticism. The ample knowledge which we have thus obtained of the depth of Mr. Faber's theological and ecclesiastical stores, and of his diligence and promptitude in using them, abates our surprise that, in the midst of a laborious investigation in which he is at present engaged, upon the early history of the Waldenses, he could so readily turn aside to throw off, as in a parenthesis, the important volume now before us. We are gratified that he enjoys the learned leisure to be able to do so, by means of the discriminating patronage of a deceased prelate, who conferred upon him one of those well furnished otium-cum-dignitate endowments—the Mastership

of Sherburn Hospital, near Durham —against which there would have been no pretext for public jealousy had they always been bestowed upon those who as well deserved and as usefully employed them.

This volume is a reply to—we will not say a challenge—but certainly a very confident appeal. The late Mr. Knox had maintained, with the Church of Rome, and contrary to the doctrine of the Protestant Churches, that we are not justified by faith through the righteousness of Christ; but through our own inherent holiness; that our being accounted righteous before God, is the consequence of our personal righteousness; or, to use Mr. Knox's own words, that "our reputative justification is the strict and inseparable *result* of this previous moral justification." The Protestant doctrine on this momentous subject—namely, that we are justified before God in virtue of the perfect righteousness of Christ through faith, and not by that infused righteousness which, though it necessarily accompanies true faith, as the tree is known by its fruits, is not the cause or precursor of justification—Mr. Knox accounted an unphilosophical dream; and, moreover, a modern figment, not known till the innovating era of the Protestant Reformation. As to the philosophy of the matter, since we did not go to philosophy for it, we are not solicitous to answer Mr. Knox's rationalistic objection, being contented with finding the doctrine in the Word of God, though it was disowned by "angelical" doctors and popish schoolmen. But the statement, that it had never been heard of till the days of Luther, Cranmer, and Calvin, requires investigation; first, in regard to the supremely important and only essential question, what are the declarations of holy writ?—secondly, in regard to the matter of historical testimony —a point of immeasurably subordinate moment, for human testimony is not authority, yet not superfluous to be inquired into, when the weak-minded are perplexed by confident assertions that a doctrine alleged to be Scriptural was wholly unknown during fifteen hundred years of church history, so that it could never have been received in Apostolic times. This Mr. Knox asserted as an historical fact; and his editor, Mr. Hornby, felt so perfectly satisfied with his statement, that he made an appeal to Mr. Faber, by name, to disprove it if he could. Mr. Faber's volume is an answer to that appeal; an answer so overwhelming, that Mr. Hornby must love truth far better than his own preconceived opinion if he is not displeased with himself at having called it forth.

But while we express our gratitude to Mr. Faber for the good service which he has achieved, we must repeat that we admit neither the challenge nor the reply, except under protest. We disclaim altogether the notion that we are to be concluded by human authority, in a matter which can be settled only by the declarations of inspired truth. How shall man be just with God? is a question which the sacred records reply to so fully and clearly, that we do not require to hold up a taper to the noon-day sun. And can we believe, without a shadow of scriptural proof, that our heavenly Father has made an appeal to antiquity indispensable, when we know that no unlearned person can possibly make it; nor practically one in a thousand, even of the clergy themselves? In the very case before us, we have Milner quoted by Mr. Knox, as admitting, that, from the end of the first century to the sixteenth, the doctrine of justification by

faith was lost sight of, and we have Mr. Faber proving the contrary. Is Mr. Hornby himself, who so confidently made the appeal to Mr. Faber, satisfied with the result of his researches? We feel assured that he is not. Who then is to decide the still litigated question? Can any man believe that God has condemned the humble and sincere inquirer to all this hard-earned uncertainty. Is he to spend his life in balancing first who are the genuine fathers, and then what were their opinions; and this only to find, as the result of his labour, that they were fallible men, like himself, and that no two of them agreed in all their notions. The Romanist practically cuts the matter short, by telling the laity to follow the priest, and the priest to follow the church—that is, his own sect, just as he finds it; and divines of the Oxford Tract school come to the same conclusion; exhorting men indeed to search the Scriptures, but not in order to ascertain what is truth, but only to confirm what their teachers tell them is catholic interpretation.

There is yet another reason why we might protest against an appeal to what are called the Fathers, upon the question of justification by faith, as controverted between Protestants and the church of Rome and her allies in other churches; namely, that by the shewing of the Romanist himself and his advocates, the Fathers cannot be expected to give a judicial opinion upon the subject. It is not pretended, we presume, that the Protestant interpretation of St. Paul's doctrine, is expressly discussed by them, and rejected; but only that they do not receive it; and that they make good works the basis of justification; or, according to Mr. Knox's language, that we are accounted righteous just because we are made righteous. Now, if, as is asserted, the Fathers never dreamed of the doctrine of justification by faith, they certainly cannot have written against it; and the only inquiry is, what do their statements incidentally prove as to their opinion? We recommend the working out of this argument to Mr. Faber; and we think that if Milner had rightly considered it, he would not have been induced to relinquish their testimony. We will notice only two points which particularly strike us. The first is their strong language relative to baptism. We do not indeed admit that the earlier and purer fathers held the doctrine on this subject of the Romanists and the Oxford Tract writers; but still their statements respecting the privileges connected with baptism were sometimes even hyperbolical; their object being to set forth undoubted verities, and there being no occasion for those cautionary restrictions which were rendered necessary, when the baptism of adult converts upon a profession of faith became a rare occurrence, Christianity having been widely established, and the great body of professed believers having been baptized in infancy; and when also the corruptions of the Church had converted both the sacraments, from being signs, seals, pledges, and means of grace, into *opus operatum* charms.

Now how is this strong language respecting baptism to be accounted for, except upon the admission of the doctrine of justification by faith? Baptism was a visible profession of faith; the adult convert came to the font as a pledge that he believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, and the same profession was assumed by proxy in the case of infants. There was not then, at the time of baptism, that cumulated obedience, which the Romanist considers the pro-

curing cause of what he calls the second justification; but there was, by personal profession, or proxied stipulation, that faith which he admits introduces to the first justification. Now the whole of the facts indicate the reception of the doctrine of justification by faith. The early church did not wait for good works as the precursors of justification; it considered the convert who received baptism in proof of the sincerity of his faith, as a justified person; a person justified by faith, not by baptism, though baptism was the sealing ordinance, and the analogy was applied, upon a presumption of faith, to infants. The very corruptions which afterwards came in, bear witness to the truth; for the Romanists, having made reputative justification, as Mr. Knox does, the result of moral justification, could not reconcile this, either to the declarations of St. Paul, or to the language of the Fathers, or to their own doctrine of baptismal justification, which implied by faith and not by works; and were therefore obliged to resort to the fiction of a first and a second justification, this second justification being susceptible of augmentation; all which would have been wholly unnecessary, had they not found that without it they could not reconcile their doctrine of justification by works with the scriptural and patristical doctrine of justification by faith.

The second point which we alluded to was this, that the language often used by the Fathers in connecting justification with personal holiness, does not prove that they did not regard justification as received by faith only through the merits of Christ. If the precise question was not under discussion by them as a matter of abstract argument, they would speak as Protestant divines do, and as the word of God does, of the *state* of the believer in connection with his *character*; and they would declare truly that no man is accounted righteous who is not also renewed after the image of Christ. When our Saviour said: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven;" we do not suppose that he was alluding to justification, but to sanctification; not to faith, but to its effects; yet it does not follow that he meant that personal holiness preceded and was the cause of justification. We could adduce numerous passages from the writings of Calvin himself (whom, by the way, Bishop Jewell calls "a reverend *Father* and a worthy ornament of the Church of God"); as well as from every other consistent advocate of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, connecting sanctification practically with justification, and oftentimes in such a manner, that if the opinion of the writer were not known, he might be supposed, with Mr. Knox, to make our being accounted righteous the consequent of our being inherently so; whereas he only means that the faith which is justifying is also sanctifying; though not justifying because sanctifying.

These things duly considered, we should not have been in the least shaken from what the venerable Fathers of our own Church, in conjunction with Luther, Calvin, and the other Protestant Fathers, clearly shewed to be the true interpretation of Holy Scripture upon the justification of a sinner, even if Mr. Faber had entirely failed in proving that the elder Fathers lucidly attested the same doctrine, at a time when there was no distinct controversy respecting it. But, on the contrary, his quotations are far more apt and decisive than could be reasonably expected, when we consider that to set forth truth rather than to

guard it, was the object of the holy men who, in addressing professed believers, urged them not to deceive themselves by a dead faith, or to separate what Christ has done for us from what his Holy Spirit must do in us.

The reader who wishes to examine Mr. Faber's references in detail, must turn to the work itself. The following is his account of his plan.

"I proceed to an examination of those theological writers, who are usually designated by the name of the Fathers of the Church: but, as it were almost an herculean labour to scrutinise them all, I shall content myself with adducing the testimonies of the first and the last, Clement of Rome in the first century and Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth; inserting, between these two extremes, what may be reasonably deemed a sufficient number of intermediate witnesses for our present purpose."

The authors cited by Mr. Faber are Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Cesarea, Ambrose, Origen, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Bernard. If the celebrated rule of Vincentius is of any practical value, we think this is a reasonably large induction for satisfying its requisitions;—it is certainly a much larger induction in proof of the *all, everywhere, and at all times,* than most divines have it in their power to make on various controverted points of Christian doctrine and discipline.

The result of this examination is as follows:—

"As I have throughout attached some remarks to the citations made from each author severally, little remains to be said upon them all collectively: yet that little, as a sort of summary, may not be altogether useless.

"The doctrine, that we are justified, not by an imputation of faith to us instead of righteousness, but by an infusion into us of personal inherent righteousness, which makes us so just in ourselves, that henceforth, for whatever good deeds we perform, we may confidently set down God in our debt-books; those good deeds being, in his bountiful estimation, strictly merits, and as such truly deserving an eternal reward: this doctrine, positively, not one of our authors, in any of the citations before us, propounds and asserts.

"On the other hand, negatively, many of them deny it even in so many words; and, unless I wholly misunderstand them, a denial of it, on the part of them all, is, by the very tenor and logical necessity of their statement, implied and supposed.

"Accordingly, what is plainly incompatible with the doctrine in question, a large proportion of them, distinctly though not scholastically, teach the opposite doctrine of Justification by an imputation to us of faith instead of righteousness: asserting, no doubt, as the Church of England asserts, that the inherent righteousness of sanctification will always follow after the extrinsic righteousness of justification, and thence that holiness and the works of holiness will always be present with a justified person; but denying, as the Church of England denies, that the holiness and holy works of the justified believer have any thing to do with the procuring of his justification.

"Nor is this all. The doctrine of Imputation even in its highest form, the form I mean, of reciprocal or alternating imputation, is distinctly maintained, by the writer to Diognetus, by Chrysostom, by Athanasius, by Augustine, and by Bernard. The writer to Diognetus speaks of the sweet interchange of our sins to Christ and of Christ's righteousness to us: Chrysostom teaches, that God made a righteous person to be a sinner, in order that he might make sinners righteous: Athanasius tells us, that the perfect righteousness of Christ, in the full accomplishment of the whole law, is imputed to the entire mass of believers: Augustine insists upon the reality of a reciprocating or interchanging imputation, so that, reputatively with God the Father, our sins become the sins of Christ, while, conversely, Christ's righteousness becomes our righteousness: and Bernard, re-echoing the doctrine of his predecessors, teaches, that the satisfaction made by one is imputed to all, even as, conversely, one bare the sins of all.

"Thus I may state, purely in the way of matter of fact. But I will add, hypothetically, yet further. Were it otherwise: were all the successive Fathers, with the exception of the three Apostolical Fathers, Clement and Ignatius and Polycarp, either silent as to the true scriptural doctrine of Justification, or even opposed to it by inculcating the doctrine of Mr. Knox and the

Church of Rome; I should still, in point of historical value of evidence, deem those three Fathers alone more than sufficient to counterbalance the whole host of their successors. Did either all those successors, or any part of them, contradict Clement and Ignatius and Polycarp, the only legitimate conclusion, on the principle of Tertullian's canon, would be: that they had departed from the faith, once delivered to the saints: that the doctrine, inculcated by the three Apostolic Fathers, was the sound doctrine, because it was the earliest; and that the doctrine, inculcated by their successors, was an adulterate doctrine, because it was introduced at a later period, and because it had not existed from the beginning.

"Happily, however, we are not driven to the unpleasantness of any such choice: but, still, were the making of any such choice imperative, I should not hesitate for a moment as to my decision. The consent of the Fathers, so far as we have noticed their consent, is satisfactory: but it is not necessary. In the way of overruling testimony, the real merits of the question lie within the narrow compass of those three Fathers, who were taught by the Apostles themselves, and who faithfully committed what they had learned to the immortality of imperishable writing."

The reader may wish to have a a passage from at least one of these three Fathers, as a specimen of the series. We will copy the very first which occurs, from the pen of the earliest of the Apostolical Fathers—the venerable Clement, whom the voice of Christian antiquity declares to have been the friend and fellow-labourer of the Apostle Paul, alluded to by him, Philippians iv. 3; and who could not but be well acquainted with the doctrines which, by Divine inspiration, that Apostle taught. St. Clement says:—

"Let us stedfastly look unto the blood of Christ: and let us see, how precious unto God is his blood; which, being shed on account of our salvation, hath offered to the whole world the grace of repentance.

"All the ancient Fathers descended from Abraham, both before the law and under the law, were glorified and magnified, not through themselves or through their works of righteous dealing which they had performed, but through his will. Therefore, we also, being called through his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves, neither through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we have done in holiness of heart, but through faith; faith, that is to say, through which the Almighty God hath justified all that ever lived; to whom be glory for ever.—Amen. What, then, should we do, brethren? Shall we idly depart from good deeds: and shall we forsake charity? The Lord forbid, that this should ever come upon us! Rather, with intensity and alacrity, let us diligently hasten to accomplish every good work. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 7, 32, 33."

It were superfluous to comment on this decisive passage in order to shew how clearly it distinguishes extrinsic justifying righteousness from in-dwelling sanctifying righteousness; and how scripturally it attributes our salvation to the blood of Christ; shewing that we are not justified through ourselves, no, not even through "works which we have done in holiness of heart," but solely "through faith;" thus altogether excluding from the office of justifying that infusion of holiness on which Mr. Knox expressly makes it to depend; while, at the same time, charity and good deeds are inculcated as the fruits of faith, and without which faith is dead. We will only say of these statements—what, indeed, is saying much—that the Articles of our own Church, and of the other Protestant churches, are not more explicit, though specially directed against the Romanist misinterpretations, than this passage which was penned in the earliest age of the Church, and which, if any thing beyond the inspired Scriptures could be called apostolical, would specially merit that appellation,

We had hoped to quote more largely from Mr. Faber, and also to have noticed several memorable portions of his argument, but we have pre-occupied the space which we had allotted to that service with our own remarks, and must therefore defer the continuation of the subject to another Number. We will, however, transcribe one passage for the serious and prayerful

consideration of those who have been led away by the unscriptural theory under examination; a theory which is not more opposed to the writings of St. Paul, though he writes most copiously upon it, than to the whole tenour of Sacred Writ. St. Paul himself refers to the instance of Abraham, and the declaration of David in the thirty-second Psalm; and our blessed Lord taught the same doctrine, as, for example, in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, the latter of whom went down to his house justified, though it is not said that he had been baptized, nor had his faith yet wrought those cumulative good deeds out of which the Romanist rears the edifice of justification.

"The result of the Anglican doctrine, or rather the perfectly harmonising result of the Reformed doctrine, is to make Christ alone, in full-orbed glory and in undivided meritoriousness, the Saviour of sinful man: while the whole drift and object and necessary tendency of the Romish doctrine, so unhappily taken up by Mr. Knox as scriptural verity, however speciously disguised and decently wrapped up in distinctions which distinguish not, is to make Church and Priest and Sacraments and Saints and Purgatory and Extreme Unction and Pilgrimage and Penance and Ordinances and Notions without end and without measure, in a word, miserable man's own self essentially embodied in his own inherent and meriting righteousness, a college of Saviours, if not avowedly supercessive of Christ, yet, to say the least, concessive with him."

(To be continued.)

SERMON ON THE DEATH OF THOMAS BABINGTON, ESQ.

A Sermon occasioned by the Death of Thomas Babington, Esq., of Rothley Temple, preached in Rothley Church, December 3, 1837. By WILLIAM ACWORTH, A. M.: Leicester. 1837.

THE Conductors of the Christian Observer have of late seen the tombs of their earlier friends and co-adjutors clustering thickly around them; and that inscribed with the honoured and beloved name of Babington has added one more to the number. We hope to be able to present to our readers some fuller notice of this excellent man; but in the mean time we will not withhold a few passages from an interesting and profitable discourse preached by Mr. Acworth upon occasion of his decease. Our revered friend had attained a good old age, having arrived within little more than twelve months of fourscore years. During a long-extended course of life, it might be truly affirmed of him that he was "not slothful in business," while he was "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." As long back as 1780, he served the office of high sheriff in his county; and he represented the borough of Leicester in five successive parliaments, extending over a period of eighteen years. He was one of the few senators of those days who, like his beloved friend Mr. Wilberforce, were not ashamed of the reproach of Christ, but were found faithful among the unfaithful, earnestly endeavouring to promote the glory of God, and the spiritual and eternal welfare of mankind, both in their private capacity and their responsible office as Christian legislators. In questions more immediately relating to morals, religion, and Christian philanthropy, he took especial interest. He was one of the early parliamentary opponents of the lottery; he contended zealously and perseveringly against the slave-trade; he strenuously urged the opening of India to Christian instruction; he was anxious to promote religious education; in

short, we might retrace his valuable public services during many a year, with those of his friends, Thornton, Wilberforce, Grant, and other faithful men, upon a variety of important questions, especially those which peculiarly demanded the vigilance of Christian senators. Our own pages bear ample witness to his ability and utility as a writer. His papers, which were numerous in some of our early volumes, are characterized by suavity, benevolence, solid judgment, knowledge of the human heart, acquaintance with the actual business of life, and a constant adaptation of the highest spiritual ethics of the Gospel to every circumstance and condition of human intercourse. Those which related to Christian education, he collected into a volume which has been deservedly popular and highly useful. It has been often said, that when Hannah More sketched the portrait of Mr. Stanley in her Cœlebs, she kept Mr. Babington in her mind's eye for a model; but whether this be truth or conjecture, it shews, at least, the judgment formed of his character by all who knew him. Doing good was his business and his delight. Of the various plans of benevolence which distinguished his day, whether spiritual or temporal, national or local, domestic or foreign, he was a liberal and laborious supporter. In the relationships of social and private life, he peculiarly endeared himself to his family and friends. By the gentleness of his manners, the humbleness of his mind, and the sweetness of his disposition, he diffused happiness to all around him. His spirit was essentially a spirit of love and peace; and a calm and cheerful acquiescence in his heavenly Father's will manifested itself so long as he retained his consciousness. He was an eminently spiritually-minded man; Mr. Wilberforce used to say, that among all his friends he did not know one more so; adding that he felt most acutely every failure in religious duty, and never attained peace of mind till he had repaired in deep humiliation to the cross of his Saviour for pardon and reconciliation. Those who knew him best, loved and revered him most; for his character gained by close inspection. The desire of pleasing God, and of living to the glory of his Saviour, was the one principle that directed him, as much in the common and hourly details of domestic life, as in the most important affairs. He possessed, in an eminent degree, those child-like dispositions which our Saviour so peculiarly marked with his approbation. He had a simple, filial trust and confidence in God, which was very striking throughout his life, but was especially remarkable during the short illness which preceded his death. When he was first attacked, he thought he should not recover, and said so distinctly; but he added, looking round him, "My dears, I have that peace of God which passeth all understanding." After that he became so much better that his medical attendants thought he would recover, but that it would be at the price of the loss of his sight, and that he would inevitably be totally blind, which he was till his death. When he first heard this afflicting intelligence, he was dejected for a short time; but his countenance soon regained its usual cheerful expression, and he said, "Well, if I cannot see, God will see me, and will not let me want for any thing;" and he never mentioned the subject again. As long as consciousness remained, he dwelt much on his mercies —his freedom from pain, the kindness of his friends, and abounded in expressions of love

and affection to them. He delighted much in having the Scriptures read to him, particularly those Psalms which speak so much of the faithfulness of God to those who put their trust in him—the 71st, the 34th, and many others. In this state he continued till a second attack deprived him of consciousness, and he remained as if asleep, till he really fell sweetly asleep in Jesus, without a struggle. It was a death remarkably in harmony with his calm and peaceful life.

But we are deviating from our object which was, not to anticipate any remarks which might occur to us should we draw up a brief sketch of his life, but only to quote a few passages from Mr. Acworth's sermon, which we now proceed to do.

"Large as has been my acquaintance with mankind, many as I have been honoured to number among my friends, who have left this world, I should ill discharge my convictions of duty if I did not on this occasion express my deliberate judgment, that we have, in the recent bereavement, lost one who had fewer defects, and who had attained more true moral and Christian excellence, than any other person whom I have ever known. This is not a solitary conviction of my own mind; it was the deliberately expressed and frequently recorded opinion of some of the most illustrious individuals of the past or present generation. One of the magistrates of this county, who, with many other individuals, acknowledges that his first religious impressions are to be traced to the instructive conversation and example of our departed friend, assured me that he heard Mr. Wilberforce, on a visit to this neighbourhood, declare, in a considerable company, that having through a long life been personally acquainted with nearly all the men who had been pre-eminently distinguished, either in the walks of literature or piety, he had never known a character in which were combined and embodied so many Christian excellencies, as in the person of him whose loss we all feel, and must long deplore. The excellent and benevolent Mr. Thornton observed of him, that there was found in his character all the virtues for which the saints, whose history is given in the Bible, were distinguished, with none of their defects."

"The religion of this pre-eminent saint, which was associated with great natural cheerfulness and equanimity of temper, was incorporated with the whole frame and habits of his life. Had his humility not forbidden him ever to speak much about himself, I think he might have told us that what was said prophetically of our Lord, was true of him: 'I have set the Lord always before me, because he is upon my right hand, therefore I shall not be moved.' It was this which gave him such remarkable integrity of mind, and steadiness of aim and purpose. He venerated God as the moral governor of the world, and therefore aimed implicitly to obey him. He contemplated him as a Father infinitely wise and good, and therefore found his richest satisfaction in loving him. He admitted and felt the title which such a being possesses, to the cheerful allegiance of his reasonable creatures, whose happiness must depend on their keeping their station and fulfilling their duties according to his revealed and perfect will. He especially regarded God as he appears in the face of his Son Jesus Christ; for his life was one of faith upon the Son of God. His perfect and efficient sacrifice formed the basis of his hope, and the ground and motive of his obedience. Thus, 'having tasted of the heavenly gift,' 'and having felt the powers of the world to come,' he daily 'walked so as to please God;' and in doing so, he realised in this world a rich reward of holy satisfaction and unbroken peace.

"In making these statements, I am offering to your attention nothing that you have not already known. I am not reading to you the history of some eminent servant of God, who lived in a remote age, or in a distant country; the person of whom we say these things lived and died among ourselves. You have all seen, the greater part of you have seen from your infancy, how 'holy and unblameably' he behaved himself in the elevated station which he occupied in this parish for more than half a century. You have witnessed his regular attendance in God's house, which was so constant, that had you not heard it stated that the prayers of the congregation were desired on his behalf as one that was sick, when you saw his place vacant on the last Lord's day before his death, you would have all presumed that such was the case. 'Indeed he was then sick, and nigh unto death;' but even then, he was so much interested

in the public ordinance of religion as to inquire with real interest what was the discourse which, had he been permitted to occupy his place, he would have heard. Since his decease I have learned that he ceased not daily in his devotions to bear your minister on his heart, and to implore that God would make him faithful, and laborious in the station in which he had been the instrument of placing him. It greatly depends, under God, upon yourselves, as well as upon him, whether these prayers shall receive an answer commensurate with the desires of him who presented them. That concern for the welfare of this parish which prompted him to become a teacher of its youth, before Sunday Schools had been brought into general existence and notice in this country, was neither diminished by ingratitude nor weakened by age. Often have I seen his bland and venerable countenance beam with delight, when he has heard that any serious impressions have been produced upon some of you, especially if followed by decided improvement in your conduct. And sometimes I have seen him, like the man after God's heart, melted into tears when he has been told of the transgressions of those from whom better things might have been expected. Indeed, in all the relations of life, as a citizen and a master, a father, a husband, he was exemplary. And in his experience, was illustrated the declaration of the Most High, 'him that honoreth me I will honor.' He was spared to a good and serene old age. He was respected by all who knew him; and those who knew him best, loved him most, as the tears shed over his grave made fully manifest. He received, in the tenderness and love and veneration which he found in the bosom of his family, the fullest recompence for the respectful and affectionate manner in which, when he was young, he had fulfilled his duties towards his relatives and friends older than himself. As he had never feared death while in health, so his mind was kept in perfect peace when his change came. He felt he could trust to that arm in crossing the valley which had sustained him in every period of his life. And that arm did not fail. To one who stood by his bed-side, he said, when awaking from a transient sleep,—'Oh, how sweet it is to feel now the peace of God, which passeth all understanding.' He then repeated lines from his favourite poet,

"Oh, for a closer walk with God,
A calm and heavenly frame,
A light to shine upon the road,
Which leads me to the Lamb."

"And a light did shine upon every step of the road, till his spirit reached the throne, for even after articulation and apparent consciousness failed, his beaming countenance expressed the indwelling of the light of God's presence. If we inquire whence sprung these shining qualities which endeared him to a very large circle of acquaintance, could he speak to us again, he would say, 'Not I, but the grace of God, that was with me.' His daily life taught us that he looked to heaven for aid to keep him in the love of God, and the faithful discharge of all his personal and relative duties. He was thus covered in the day of battle, so that in the most trying situations, when crossed and thwarted in the completion of the schemes of benevolence, in which the lives and liberties of his fellow creatures were involved, he was not unfrequently seen returning late at night or early in the morning from the House of Commons, not only meditating some portion of God's word, but audibly repeating it. So truly was he clothed with humility, that I scarcely ever remember to have heard him refer to any thing which he had ever done to promote the cause of religion, or the welfare of mankind. It is, however, probably well known that he toiled incessantly, as a senator and private individual, to promote the abolition of Slavery, in connection with his most intimate friend Mr. Wilberforce, who lived just long enough to hear its death blow struck by the British Parliament. With that eminent man, if he did not originate, he largely contributed to a periodical, called the Christian Observer, which has rendered especial service to the cause of genuine religion in this land, and is still entitled to the support of every friend of piety. He also proved the great integrity of his mind, in obeying at all cost and sacrifice his conviction of duty, in supporting largely and prominently some of those noble institutions which were born in reproach and contumely; but which God has maintained to be 'the stability' of our times and the glory of our land. It is our consolation to know, that excellent as he was, we may avail ourselves of the same grace he sought, if we seek it as he did, by earnest prayer. It seems that he sought it in early life. The tenderness and devotion of his mother, whom he happened when a child to see on her knees in her own closet, appears to have been the occasion of his earliest serious impressions. Throughout the whole of his life, even down to grey hairs, he scarcely ever mentioned his mother without tears. They showed that no lapse of

time, and no change of condition, could obliterate the impression which her maternal solicitude and counsel and love had produced. Thus, one more instance is added to many others which the history of the church in every age presents, that they who have pre-eminently distinguished themselves in the Christian walk, who have jeopardied their lives in the high places of the Christian field, and who have led the van of the sacramental hosts of God's elect; have been religiously educated; and through grace obeyed the heavenly call when the dew of their youth was fresh upon them. But I must conclude; rude as is my sketch, unfinished as is my portraiture, of one whom I was honoured to recognise as my counsellor, my guide, and 'my own familiar friend,' yet its execution, imperfect as it is, has given me real and substantial enjoyment. I shall keep it before me; and while it reminds me what he was, I trust, by God's help, it will incite me to become wiser and better."

NEW ZEALAND COLONIZATION.

1. *The Objects of the New Zealand Associations.*
2. *British Colonization in New Zealand, published by the New Zealand Association.*
3. *Letter to Lord Glenelg upon the Principles, Objects, and Plans of the New Zealand Association,* by DANDESON COATES, Esq.
4. *Mr. Coates and the New Zealand Association; in a Letter to Lord Glenelg;* by E. G. WAKEFIELD, Esq.

IN your last Number, we made some remarks on the plan of the New Zealand Association, and the dangers to New Zealand with which it is fraught; but we intimated, that we had not exhausted the subject; and it is the more important to resume it, because it is publicly stated that a charter has been promised from the crown; and the only hope now of saving the New Zealanders from the miseries attending colonization is by the interposition of parliament. If the plan is as wise and benevolent as is alleged, let it, in the first instance, be fairly and openly investigated by the legislature; and if it stand that test, let an Act be granted for carrying it into effect; but the country has a just right to protest against the grant, by her Majesty's ministers, of a charter at their discretion, which is to supersede public inquiry, and to render unavailing the strongest arguments and remonstrances that may be afterwards urged against the measure. The attempt to preoccupy the ground by procuring a charter from the crown, instead of going openly to parliament with a bill for legislative sanction, appears to us a breach of faith; for the documents of the Association, only a few months ago, expressly mentioned that last session, "after a correspondence and several interviews between the committee and members of her Majesty's government, preparation was made for bringing a bill into parliament to give effect to the objects of the association;" but that "the demise of the crown defeated the purpose." The committee however passed a resolution, stating that "this committee are satisfied with the progress that has been made in negociating for the consent of her Majesty's government to the introduction of a bill for giving effect to the views of the association, and will use their best endeavours to procure an act for that purpose during the next [the present] session." All mention of a charter is kept back; so that those who had heard of the scheme, but conscientiously disapproved of it, naturally supposed that it would be discussed in parliament like that of any other Joint Stock company, and that their objections

would thus be openly heard and met. If, in the mean time, "her Majesty's government," (meaning we suppose, her Majesty's *ministers*) have been induced to promise a charter from the crown, instead of merely giving their consent to the introduction of a bill into parliament for legislative investigation, as the Association's resolution specified, we cannot think that the objectors have been fairly dealt with.

The scheme of the association, as explained in its authorized publications, is shortly this. The association, when incorporated, is to purchase a tract or tracts of land in New Zealand for the site of a British colony, which is to be placed under the government of the association—and, that it may be so placed, the sovereign rights of the tribes over the land are to be purchased by the association and ceded to the crown. The association is to sell, at an advanced price, land situated within the colony to British subjects wishing to settle there. The profits derived from this purchase and resale of land, are to constitute a fund, out of which, and the colonial taxes, the association undertakes to pay all the expenses of governing the colony. The forming and regulating of the colony is to be committed to certain persons to be selected from among the projectors, and who are to be called "Founders of settlements in New Zealand." The powers of these founders are thus described:

"They would form a corporation and would be authorized to make treaties with the native tribes for cessions of territory, and all other purposes: to administer, upon lands ceded to the crown, the whole system of colonization, including the receipt and expenditure of the colonial funds; to establish courts in the settlements for the administration of British law; to make regulations for local purposes, having the force of law within the settlements; to exempt natives in the British settlements from the operation of some British laws which are inapplicable to their present uncivilized state, and to make special regulations for their government; to provide for the defence and good order of the settlements by means of a militia, a colonial force of regulars, and a colonial marine: to delegate portions of their authority to bodies or individuals resident in the settlements; and to appoint and remove at pleasure all such officers as they might require for carrying the whole measure into effect." (British Colonization, pp. 65, 66.)

The association further consider, that it would be "no infraction of native independence," if "the government of the British settlements were authorised to seize, try, and punish British subjects, for crimes committed on native territory, and to seize runaway convicts who had settled there:" an authority, however, "not to be exercised except as regards districts where the native tribes had, by formal treaty, agreed to its exercise."—Ibid. 57.

The committee propose certain checks against the abuse of their powers; such as that all general regulations shall be submitted to one of the secretaries of state for approval; that the vacancies among the founders shall be filled up by the crown; and that the proceedings of the corporation shall be regularly laid before parliament; but a colony at the antipodes would not feel itself under much restraint by parchment regulations, when it found itself able to defy or to parry off any unwelcome interference with its projects. During a long series of years, dispatch upon dispatch was sent out to India, solemnly deprecating the lust of conquest and the acquisition of new territory; and yet the successive governors and councils contrived, one after the other, to make out some "unavoidable necessity" for violating these stringent regulations, till, with Punic aggression, the bull's hide that was to be the first limit of our territorial possession, was elongated into the ever-elastic thongs which cir-

cumscribe our present frightfully gigantic oriental empire. Look again at the unjust and cruel pressure upon the aborigines at the Cape of Good Hope, and in various other of our colonial dependencies. In the projected New Zealand colony, the period when the will and the power to assert independence, should the mother country see fit to interfere with the aggressions of the colonists upon the aborigines, or with any of their plans or proceedings, would the more rapidly approach, as the settlement is to start at once as a well-furnished community; and is not to be bridled, as other colonies have usually been, by direct British power; but to have its own military force, and to be endued with the formidable array of prerogatives above specified. Livy tells us (Book xxxiv.) the following story:—There was a quarrel between the Carthaginian colonists and the Numidian aborigines about territory. Both parties sent delegates to Rome; the Carthaginians alleging that they claimed no more than had been ceded to them; the Numidians saying that the Carthaginians were foreigners who had no original territorial title beyond the extent of their bull's hide; and "that whatever acquisitions they had made beyond Byrsa, they held by fraud or violence." The parliament of Rome, finding they could not decide the matter, sent out three commissioners to the colony; who, after hearing both sides, declined giving any opinion, and left the question as they found it. Livy says, that he is not sure whether they acted from their own discretion, or from directions from the colonial office in Rome; but it was, he says, "highly expedient to leave the question undecided." The colony of Carthage has been the prototype of too many similar establishments in all ages;—witness, for example, the United States of America, which have driven back and nearly exterminated most of the aboriginal tribes. Their agents were only to negociate and make fair bargains; but they introduced ardent spirits, and kept the chiefs intoxicated for days or weeks together, till they purchased their lands for a nominal consideration, and proceeded to turn out the possessors with force of arms. Even the colonists of queen Dido professed to pay honestly for their bull's-eye territory; but, as Rollin oddly enough, but aptly for our illustration, remarks—"The Greek word Byrsa comes from the Hebrew Bosra, which signifies Fortification;" so that the real bull's hide was a fort, and the payment a shower of missiles. Virgil describes the too frequent process of colonization; we only hope that if New Zealand is to be molested, our gracious queen Victoria will not be made the "dux fœmina facti," by granting a charter of incursion.

Conveniunt quibus aut odium crudele tyranni
Aut metus acer erat; naves quæ forte paratæ
Corripiunt, onerantque auro; portantur avari
Pygmalionis opes pelago; dux fœmina facti.
Devenere locos ubi nunc ingentia cernes
Mœnia, surgentemque novæ Carthaginis arcem:
Mercatique solum, facti de nomine Byrsam,
Taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo.

As we have trespassed so far with quotations, we will add a few lines from Lord Glenelg's own admirable dispatch of Dec. 26, 1835, to the governor of the British Settlements in South Africa. His Lordship says:—

"It is a melancholy and humiliating, but an indisputable truth, that the contiguity of the subjects of the nations of Christendom with uncivilized tribes, has invariably produced the wretchedness, and decay, and not seldom the utter extermination, of the weaker

party. This uniform result must be attributed, not to any necessary cause, but to the sinister influence of those evil passions, which, in such circumstances, find but too much to provoke, and too little to restrain, them. Of all the chapters in the history of mankind, this is perhaps the most degrading. Nor is there any one great course of events on which every humane mind dwells with such settled aversion and shame, as on that which records the intercourse between the Christian states of Europe, and the heathen nations of America and Africa. I know not that a greater real calamity could befal Great Britain, than that of adding Southern Africa to the list of the regions which have seen their aboriginal inhabitants disappear under the withering influence of European neighbourhood."

There is another self-denying restriction which the association proposes, namely, that its powers should be granted only for a limited number of years, (leaving in blank the period to be named) after which, "the crown and parliament would review the whole subject." But then it may be too late to remedy the evils already inflicted on the natives, and *vested rights* (as vested wrongs are always called) in the colonists will render it impracticable for the British government to retrace its steps.

We ought not to omit that much is said of an intention "to defray, from the common fund of the colony, the expense of erecting places of worship, and of paying the officiating ministers;" and, in this application of the colonial funds, "no preference" is to "be given to any one denomination of Christians" (ib. c. 7); and the crown is to be authorized, upon application from the founders to appoint a bishop for New Zealand, the colony defraying all the expenses, (ib. p. 71)—a plan which it is affirmed that all the members of the association, including the dissenting and the radical portion, have approved of. Why then do not Lord Durham, Sir W. Molesworth, and their colleagues in the association, urge their friends in the cabinet to send out a bishop to Quebec, where there is surely as much need of one as in New Zealand. For the present New Zealand might be united to the diocese of Australia; with more reason at least than the Cape of Good Hope to England or India.

We will now narrate the substance of Mr. Coates's objections to the proposed scheme.

1. It is impracticable "to put savage or semi-barbarous men fully in possession of the consequences of such a transfer of their lands to the association, as that contemplated;" an objection, which has the greater weight, as the transfer involves the purchase of the sovereignty, and must be effected on terms to allow a considerable profit on the re-sale. The scheme is founded on that species, at least, of fraud, which consists in the "suppressio veri."

2. The powers which the association demands, are monstrous; and such as will necessarily lead to collision and war with the natives; the colonists having, as the association admits, "purposes of their own to pursue." Is it not monstrous to commit to a joint-stock corporation all the powers of sovereignty; not only the administration of justice, but of legislative authority, and even power to make treaties "for any purpose;" and power to raise a "militia," and "regulars," and a "marine?" Is it possible that such powers can be entrusted to the corporation—aye, and a power to "delegate portions" of this authority to individuals residing at the antipodes—without producing those collisions the result of which is but too obvious? To commit such power to a corporation cannot relieve the government of Great Britain from its deep responsibility in this matter. It seems strange to us, if, without the sanction of parliament, the

crown can thus devolve its own duties on a corporation; though there may probably be precedents for so doing found in the days of high prerogative.

We would however suggest this consideration to those whom it may concern, whether, if a British subject were seized in New Zealand under the authority of the government of the colony, and acquitted of the charge, and should afterwards meet in New South Wales with the individual who had seized him, and should bring such individual before the supreme court in New South Wales, for the assault and imprisonment committed in New Zealand, the royal charter granted to the New Zealand Association would be held a justification by a court exercising jurisdiction under an act of parliament.

3. Mr. Coates's great and conclusive objection is one, "grounded on the experience of ages, and instances without number," that, in every scheme of colonization in which commercial advantage has formed an ingredient, the result, "without one solitary instance as an exception," has been "calamity and misery to the native population." This principle Mr. Coates has established beyond controversy in the first nine pages of his letter to Lord Glenelg; and he argues irresistibly, "that the influences operating both on the colonists and the natives being unchangeably the same, the consequences must be the same also." (pp. 9, 10.) "Calamity and misery" to the New Zealanders would be the inevitable result of the proposed colony, even if the purchase of the land could be equitably accomplished, and if the colony were established without the formidable array of military and naval strength which is demanded.

4. Mr. Coates's last, and not least, important objection is this; that the missions to the northern island have gone already far towards conferring on the natives the blessings of Christianity and civilization; and, by the blessing of God, have a good prospect of completing, at no very distant period the work which they have happily commenced; but that they would be involved in the disastrous consequences which he anticipates from the establishment of the colony.

In answer to Mr. Coates, Mr. Edward Gibbon Wakefield stepped forward in defence of the association, with a zeal indicating some peculiar interest in the scheme; and he also addressed his pamphlet to Lord Glenelg in the form of a letter.

The objection which we have placed as the first, he passed by unnoticed. The second he answered by calling it a "bugaboo fallacy." With the third objection he does attempt to struggle. He agrees with Mr. Coates on "the abstract question," as he calls it—that is, on the evils which have resulted from modern colonization; but "the plan of the association differs from all other plans." It does differ, but not so as to afford any prospect of a different result. It leaves the elements of collision between the colonists and the natives the same as in every former experiment. The objects of the colonists are the same—the acquisition of wealth or competency; the feelings of the natives are the same, the love of independence and a disposition to plunder. A different mode of proceeding is proposed as to the purchase and re-sale of land; but the difference will not diminish, if it does even increase, the risk of collision; what then are the particulars of difference on which Mr. Edward Gibbon Wakefield relies as calculated to prevent what has hitherto been the invariable result of modern coloniza-

tion? He shall speak for himself.

"The New Zealand Association consists of two classes of members; first, heads of families and others, who have determined to establish themselves in the proposed colony; secondly, public men, who, *for the sake of public objects alone*, are willing, to use their own words in addressing Her Majesty's Government, to undertake the responsible and not very easy task of carrying the whole measure into effect." (p. 13.)

It is surely very obliging to Her Majesty's government, thus to propose relieving them from a part of their onerous duties, especially as "neither the authors of this plan, nor any of those in whom authority would be vested for carrying it into execution, have any pecuniary interest in it" (p. 6). No *pecuniary* interest! nothing but the patronage connected with it. No *pecuniary* interest, though they may, "as individuals, become proprietors of land in New Zealand, or holders of the colonial stock" (British Colonization, p. 65.) No pecuniary interest! How could Mr. Coates do otherwise than "give the gentlemen connected with the plan full credit for the purity of their motives, and the benevolence of their intentions." (Coates' Letter to Lord Glenelg, p. 9). He did this in the spirit of Christian charity, when he wrote his letter to Lord Glenelg dated 27th Nov. 1837. But now for the *dénouement*. In the Watchman of Jan. 17, 1838, appeared a letter dated the 4th Jan. addressed to Mr. Wakefield by Mr. W. White, the identical missionary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society whose testimony the committee of the association had largely availed themselves of, and whose opinion they had quoted in favour of forming a colony in New Zealand (British Colonization, pp. 152—163, 193—196, 230—238, 254—259, 303—306). Mr. White says:

"Considering the manner in which I have been identified and mixed up with the object, principles, and plans of the association, and plainly perceiving that I have an important though painful and humiliating duty to perform to myself as well as others, I no longer hesitate. It is therefore with no small degree of concern, that I feel myself bound to confess, as it regards the objects and principles of the association, and particularly those of certain parties engaged in it, that up to Thursday last, the 28th ultimo, I had been misled, and a gross deception had been practised upon me."

After quoting (among other things) the profession made by the public men who patronize the association, that they had *public objects* alone in view, Mr. White charges four members of the committee by name, with having avowed, in his hearing, "that they entered into the association, and became members of the committee, with the sole and exclusive object of promoting Mr. Edward Gibbon Wakefield's scheme, and of placing him at the head of it." Are the professions of the committee come to this? Has the public—has the colonial office been deluded? Will not the members of the committee, who are not implicated in the charge, examine into its truth or falsehood, and, (if they find it true) withdraw from the concern? Will the government devolve the duties of administration on such an association? Is it to a committee so constituted, that the destinies of New Zealand are to be intrusted? Is this the difference which is to preserve New Zealand from the calamities with which hitherto modern colonization has invariably been attended?

But possibly Mr. Wakefield, and the four gentlemen who for his sake alone (if Mr. White's account is credited) entered into the association, will be laid aside; and "public men" will be sought for, willing, "*for the sake of public objects alone*," to undertake the responsible, "and *not very easy*

task, of carrying the whole "measure into effect." Will this afford any security to the New Zealanders? Not unless these public men are *qualified*, as well as willing, to undertake such a task on such terms—nor unless a *succession* of such men can be secured to supply the place of those who, from time to time, may die or cease to act. Is it possible to find such men, and a *succession* of such men? He who should expect it would betray a total ignorance of human nature: and, if it were possible, still the object would not be accomplished. The wisest and best committee, meeting in London, could not control the selfish views and passions of colonists at the antipodes, or prevent the abuse of the large powers which, for the security of the colony, it would be necessary to commit to the colonial government. Nay, we are sorry to say that many men, who might be supposed proper persons to watch over others, betray such moral apathy on these subjects that they could not be trusted. Witness the following passage in Sir John Ross's Narrative of his Second Voyage to the Arctic Regions:—"Our brandy was as odious as our pudding to our Esquimaux visitors, and they have yet, therefore, to acquire the taste which has, in ruining the morals, hastened the extermination of their American neighbours to the southward. If, however, these tribes must finally disappear, as seems their fate, it is at least better that they should die gradually by force of rum, than that they should be exterminated in masses by the fire and sword of the Spanish conquest; since there is some pleasure, such as it is, in the mean time, while there is also a voluntary but slow surrender in exchange for murder and robbery. Is it not the fate of the savage and the uncivilized on this earth to give way to the more cunning and the better informed, to knowledge and civilization? It is the order of the world, and the right one; nor will all the lamentations of a mawkish philanthropy, with its more absurd or censurable efforts, avail one jot against an order of things as wise as it is assuredly established."

But what are the public objects which Mr. Wakefield ascribes to the projectors of the scheme? He says:—

"The plan of the association has been most carefully matured by some of the wisest and best men in this country, and for the express purpose of shewing, by a practical example, that there is a mode of colonization by which the savage natives of a thinly peopled country, and especially a race with so fine a capacity for civilization as the New Zealanders, may be preserved from the horrors of lawless colonization, and led to embrace the religion, language, laws, and social habits of an advanced country." (Wakefield's Letter, p. 12).

Doubtless Mr. Wakefield's four friends are "some of the wisest and best men in the country," though Mr. White imputes to them other objects than these; and doubtless Mr. Wakefield himself, who (according to Mr. White's account) asserted that he "*alone* had done the whole real business of the association," is one "of the wisest and best men in this country;" and yet Mr. White's letter casts some suspicion over the scheme.

Besides, what occasion is there for the experiment, which is represented as the object of the philanthropic projectors? In different islands of the South Seas may be seen exhibited, not a solitary practical example, but several practical examples, "that there is a mode," not of colonization indeed, but of missionary labour, "by which the savage natives" may be "led to embrace the religion," and with the religion the civilization "and social habits of an advanced" Christian country; and in the mode sanctioned, not only by these prac-

tical examples, but by the command and promise of our Divine Lord and Master. The missionaries in New Zealand have been, and are, labouring to convert and civilize the natives. Under the blessing of God, much success, in both particulars, has attended their labours, obstructed though they have been by the demoralizing influence of "runaway convicts and runaway sailors." Let not their labours be further obstructed by colonization on system, with a "militia," and a "force of regulars," and a "colonial marine," calculated (as this apparatus of *civilized warfare* necessarily would be) to rouse the jealousies and suspicions and ill-will of the New Zealanders against Europeans; and the Gospel of Peace, we may confidently hope, will, at no very distant period, triumph, and save the projectors of the New Zealand association the need of their projected experiment.

But the association, Mr. Wakefield reminds us, has in its book a chapter entitled "Religious Establishment." It has — and it promises to provide a bishop and clergy, and ministers of all denominations, without any expense to this country. A church establishment in New Zealand, without expense to the state; to be provided out of the colonial funds;—of course, though it may not be so stated, to be provided, *after* all the expenses of the civil and military establishment, of the court of justice, of the "militia," the "regulars," and the "colonial marine" shall have been paid. When will that be?

But, says Mr. Wakefield, "British colonization . . . . is going on in New Zealand;" colonization "of the most disorderly, the most licentious kind." This is true; but will the establishment of the proposed colony prevent this mischief? Will the "runaway convicts and runaway sailors" locate themselves within the limits of the colony? Assuredly not. They will hover in the territories of neighbouring chiefs, just on the boundaries of the colony, seizing every opportunity of plundering the colonists, and exciting the natives to predatory excursions against the colony: while the disorderly inhabitants of the colony, whether British or native—and such the colony *will* have, notwithstanding its religious establishment — will be continually taking refuge among the neighbouring tribes. Then the colonial authorities will attempt to seize, or call on the independent chiefs to deliver up, the criminals; and then the "militia," and the "force of regulars," and the "colonial marine" will be brought into action; and this is the new "mode of colonization by which . . . . . the new Zealanders" are to "be preserved from the horrors of a lawless colonization, and led to embrace the religion, language, laws, and social habits of an advanced country!" This is the wisdom of "some of the wisest . . . . . men in this country!"—for by such, we are assured, this plan was matured. A "militia," and a "force of regulars," and a "colonial marine" would, indeed, be essential to the protection of any colony which should be established in New Zealand under the auspices of the British Government: and, because they would be an essential part of any such scheme, any and every such scheme must issue in war and bloodshed, if not in the extermination of the natives.

Mr. Wakefield insinuates, that the missionaries are colonizing New Zealand; and that Mr. Coates has therefore no right to object to colonization. But the missionaries have no "militia," no "regulars," no "marine." They went unarmed among the

savage natives, trusting alone to the protection of Him in whose name they went, proclaiming the Gospel of salvation. They went as "men of peace," as "messengers of peace;" as such they were received; as such they obtained and enjoy the confidence and good-will of the natives; as such they have had influence to prevent war; and peace, order, and civilization have attended their measures.

Still we are reminded of the "lawless colonization" which is going on in New Zealand. Mr. Wakefield says, "*Something must* be done; this is admitted by every body." Now this is just begging the question. If this "lawless colonization" can be put down, without inflicting on the New Zealander greater evils, it ought to be put down; but if it cannot, then it must be left as an irremediable evil, and the lawless settlers alone are responsible for that evil. The proposed colony not only will not be able to put down "lawless colonization," but will aggravate its mischiefs, and inflict still further calamities on New Zealand; till "this noble race" (to use the language which Mr. White applies to the hypothesis of Mr. Wakefield's being placed, but which may also be applied to the case of any other individual's being placed, at the head of the colony)—"this noble race of New Zealanders will be added to the numerous tribes who have dwindled away, and disappeared before the lust of power and the love of dominion"—and we must add the love of money and the lust of gain—"of their more intelligent and more powerful fellow-men."

But "the work of depopulation is already proceeding fast," says Mr. Wakefield, quoting, as his authority, the Rev. Mr. Williams: and he *assumes* that the plan of the association is the best or only remedy. But this is mere assumption. The causes of the depopulation which is going on, are the vices and wars of the natives; the demoralizing influence and the outrages of Europeans, principally of British subjects. Now what operation would the establishment of a colony, limited to a part of the island, have on these causes? The "runaway convicts and runaway sailors" who now infest the island, would infest it still: nor would they subject themselves to the restraints of British law, by locating themselves within the colony, where they would not be able to purchase land without paying for it a higher price than for land beyond its boundaries. "Lawless colonization" would still go on; nor (unless it be intended to put down *grog-shops* in New Zealand, while we allow *gin-palaces* in our own country) has the proposed scheme of colonization any tendency to check the vices of the natives, or the demoralizing influence of Europeans. Wars, instead of being repressed, would be fomented, by establishing a colony, which, while it pursues objects of its own, mercantile and agricultural, is to be furnished with a "militia," a "force of regulars," and a "colonial marine," and would be surrounded, not only with native tribes fierce in their independence, jealous of foreign interference, and unacquainted with the international law of civilized nations, but by those tribes influenced and encouraged to commit depredations in the colony by lawless colonists, "runaway convicts, and runaway sailors," residing among them.

But the proposed colonial court is that on which reliance is principally placed, as tending to remedy existing evils, as calculated to repress and punish offences com-

mitted in the island by British subjects. It is not doubted that it might be a benefit to the New Zealanders, if they had a British court at hand, competent to take cognizance of such offenders—provided there be the means of bringing the offenders before the court. The association anticipates that the chiefs will consent to the colonial government's seizing such offenders within the native territory, and bringing them to justice. Will they so consent? Will they not at once take alarm at a colony, with a "militia," and a "force of regulars," and a "colonial marine?"

The New Zealanders are too shrewd a race to trust such a colony. It was not by such means that the missionaries obtained their confidence. If you wish to give them the benefit of a British court of justice, it must be a court unconnected with colonization, having no other object than the welfare of the natives, and trusting, without any military array, to their good will. A sketch of such a scheme was proposed by the committee of the House of Commons, which made an important report on the state of the "Aborigines;" and Mr. Coates, in his letter to Lord Glenelg, made some additional suggestions; but this plan Mr. Wakefield treats as "feeble," and as one "of which the operation, too, would be confined to one corner of a country nine hundred miles long."

It is indeed feeble, if to be without a "militia," and a "force of regulars," be feebleness; but to the plan of the association its very *strength* is the objection. The plan of colonization is a remedy *so strong*, that it will inevitably destroy the patient. The strength of the plan suggested by the "Aborigines" committee and Mr. Coates, is its *moral strength*. It would gain the confidence of the natives; they would co-operate with it; they would seize, and *(if necessary)* invoke British aid to seize, British subjects committing offences in New Zealand; and thus would its operation extend over the whole island—whereas, for want of such co-operation, the operation of the proposed colonial court would be "confined to one corner of a country nine hundred miles long"—to the boundaries of the ceded land.

View it in whatever light we may, the plan of the New Zealand association, with its magnificent promises, holds forth no reasonable ground to expect any alleviation to the evils now afflicting the island, but every reason to anticipate an aggravation of "calamity and misery" to the natives; together with obstruction, if not suspension, to those missionary labours, which, under the Divine blessing, have ameliorated, and will (if not obstructed by colonization with military array) continue to ameliorate, their condition; and by a steady though gradual process raise them to the rank of a civilized people, while the Gospel of Christ will exalt them to far higher privileges, as children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.

OBITUARY.

MRS. CORRIE.

In our volume for 1837, p. 479, we gave some account of the life of the beloved Bishop Corrie, in the course of which occurs the following paragraph:—"In November, 1812, he married Miss Myers, who proved to him a help-meet from

the Lord. Her mind was strong, her judgment excellent, her natural talents were cultivated with great care, and her affections purified and regulated by the word and Spirit of God. After twenty-four years of happy union Mrs. Corrie died at Madras, in December, 1836; alas! to be followed, in six short weeks, by him whose removal we now deplore."

The necessity of procuring facts from India prevented our adding at that time a few particulars, which ought not to be passed over, respecting this excellent and accomplished lady. Those of our readers who possess our volume for 1814 may remember that we had the satisfaction of defending our countrywomen in India from the aspersions of Maria Graham, who had written, in a flippant à-la-Trollope style, a "Journal of a Residence in India," in which she spoke in the most disparaging terms of the British ladies there resident; representing them as mere dolls and dawdles; inane, frivolous, selfish, and conceited. Now we are far from saying that the education and pursuits of our countrywomen at that period might not, without disparagement, have been rendered more solid and intellectual; but the wives, sisters, and daughters of English gentlemen in India, were not below the standard of their sisters in England; and we were able to shew, by a variety of interesting facts and allusions, that Miss Graham's estimate was as unjust as it was degrading. She doubtless saw much that was gay and frivolous; but she overlooked the unobtrusive virtues of the keepers at home, who loved their husbands and children, and tended their nurseries, and read, and wrote, and conversed, as became well-educated Christian women; finding time, moreover, and strength, even in that exhausting climate, to aid those objects of religious benevolence which Maria Graham ridiculed, but God has abundantly blessed and prospered.

Among the interesting portraits which we had the pleasure of exhibiting were the following of a mother and daughter: "Materna, carried at an early age from England, and with no advantages for her own education, has successfully attended to self-improvement, that she might become qualified to cultivate the talents of her daughter;—a daughter whose varied and valuable acquirements would reflect honour on parents and connexions even in this distinguished country, where every help for education abounds. Elizabeth of India may be justly named together with England's Elizabeth Smith; their mental and moral graces bear a similar stamp. The young person here mentioned has studied French, Italian, Latin, Hebrew, and Syriac, besides more than one of the languages of India, her native country, though her parents are English; nor has she ever breathed a purer air."

We hope that our readers have anticipated that "Elizabeth of India" was Miss Myers, who married Mr. Corrie in 1812. "Materna" has survived her beloved daughter, who, by the blessing of God on her admirable training, became an invaluable friend, companion, and fellow-labourer in the Gospel to the sainted man, whose deep affliction upon the loss of her was cut short in tender pity.

For the particulars which we are about to add, we are indebted to the "South India Christian Repository;" a new Madras quarterly publication, conducted with talent, learning, and piety, under the care of the Rev. Mr. Cotterill, lately appointed one of the chaplains have at Madras. We beg pardon if we transgressed in obtruding a name which does not obtrude itself; but it may gratify our Cambridge friends to be reminded that the alma mater of Henry Martyn has given another senior wrangler to the service of Christ in India. We believe the bishop, in part, drew up the following account himself, so that it embalms his own memory with that of his beloved partner.

Mrs. Corrie's parents were among the first fruits of the ministry of the late Rev. David Brown, many years senior chaplain in Calcutta. She was brought up with great care, and had the privilege of being very much in Mr. Brown's family. Her mother preserved her from the influence of native servants, and herself instructed her in the various branches of female education at an early age. Mr. Brown, perceiving her aptness to learn, took great pleasure in teaching her the elements of Hebrew and Syriac; and the Scriptures in the original Hebrew were familiar to her. She acquired, in early life, a correct knowledge of both French and Italian, and had read some of the best authors in those languages. Such, however, was her aversion to any thing approaching to display, that only those who were in habits of familiar intercourse with her could conceive of her mind and extensive acquirements. The instructions of her mother had impressed her mind with a reverence for religion in childhood; and when about thirteen years old, during a course of catechising by Mr. Brown in his family, she began to view religion as a personal concern. From that time to her death,

it held the first place in her affections, and was the mainspring of that activity in duty, and that cheerful piety, which distinguished her.

For many years she had been subject to attacks of fever, which frequently brought her very low. These, with family trials, at length caused a complaint, for which change of air to the Cape was recommended. From that experiment she derived considerable benefit. In 1835, her husband, in his way from England after his consecration, joined her at the Cape, and they arrived together at Madras in October of that year. From that period she continued to improve, and was pretty well up to May, 1836. Her health then began to fall off; and, in June, she was brought very low; but she again recovered so considerably, that the Bishop left her without apprehension, at the end of August, to go on the primary visitation of his diocese. After his departure, however, she became weaker and weaker; and, finally, took to her bed in November, from whence she rose no more. Her Bible, which had been her daily companion through her life, was constantly beside her, or read to her, together with 'Baxter's Saints' Rest,' and 'Serle's Christian Remembrancer.' On November 15th his Lordship returned home. He found her much reduced, but still in no apparent danger. On Sunday, December 18th, he left her to hold a Confirmation at Poonamallee. On Monday morning a great change for the worse came on; and her medical adviser, in answer to the Bishop's inquiries, made him acquainted with his apprehension of the result. On Mrs. Corrie's requesting to know his opinion, his Lordship told her that it was doubtful whether she would recover. She shewed no sign of agitation at the intelligence. She had long thought, she said, that this might be the issue. She spoke with deep feeling of her own unworthiness, and want of improvement of former mercies:—she had been brutish (she said) under chastisements, and careless in prosperity:—she had no hope but in Christ, adding,—

'Jesus, thy blood and righteousness
My beauty are, my glorious dress'—

with more to that effect; and desired that her love might be conveyed to her mother, who had been to her a good mother. When she took leave of her, she had asked forgiveness of any undutifulness; which she now was glad of. She desired her love to the other dear child (Miss Corrie being present) and to her husband and little one: adding, "I could wish to have seen the dear thing." It was observed, she need have no uneasiness about those she was leaving behind. She replied, she had none—"This dear child (turning to her eldest daughter,) is blest, and will be blest:" and she "trusted the other, and her husband, are in the right way." On the bishop's asking if talking in this manner agitated her, she said, "No: she wished to converse thus, as she might afterwards not be able to speak."

On the Bishop returning, after a short absence from the room, Mrs. Corrie, addressing him, said, "Am I safe?" He replied, "You know as well as I, that 'if any one sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.'" "But," said the sufferer, "will he receive me?" The Bishop answered, "Does he not say, 'Come unto me?'" and reminded her of the passage, which her early friend and pastor, the Rev. D. Brown, when on his death-bed, pointed out as the most surprising passage in all the Bible (Jeremiah iii. 1.) The verse was read to her; on which, after a pause, she said, "Yes; I feel that I am a child, though a naughty one;"—adding, "Though some were farther off from the brazen serpent than others, yet as many as looked lived."

The Bishop afterwards prayed. When desiring for her that a sense of the Saviour's pardoning love might be vouchsafed her, his feelings prevented his further utterance for a time; when she gently whispered, "and pray that I may be sanctified." She said also about this time, that she desired not merely to escape punishment, but to be made like God in holiness. At about seven o'clock, as usual, his Lordship prayed with her before retiring. She enjoyed more of rest during that night than she had previously been accustomed to; and, in consequence, appeared somewhat better on Tuesday morning, so that hopes of her recovery revived. The Bishop prayed with her on awaking; and during the day read a portion of John xiv. and xvii. Her conversation was altogether on passages of Scripture, and verses of hymns, relating to the Saviour and his finished work: nor in conversing with her husband did she again revert to any earthly subject. There being no regularity in their conversation, her family could not remember all the particular passages or verses which occupied her thoughts; but the line, "Jesus, thy blood and righteousness," was several times repeated by her. About two o'clock on Wednesday morning, perceiving her a little quiet, the Bishop was about to leave

the bed-side; when she said, "Do not go; though I cannot speak to you, you can suggest things to me." Soon after she said, "If I live till six, I will take some strong coffee; it is good for this hard breathing; and, if not, I shall be where I wish." His Lordship continued, at intervals, to repeat some passages of Scripture and verses of hymns, which she sometimes took up, or helped him to finish. One of her remarks was, "When one comes into these circumstances, we cannot but see our great unprofitableness." Once, when she seemed a little easy, her husband said, "Can you repose in the arms of your heavenly Father?" She added: "and in Jesus the Mediator." At another time she said, "I dare not doubt his power, or his willingness:" at another time, "Whom he loveth, he loveth to the end." Soon after she said, "There I shall see our dear ones: we have two in heaven, and two on the way." Then, to her daughter, she said, "See that you follow—and tell Laura the same—that none of our family be wanting." The Bishop said, "You will see your dear father too;" and she added, "and my grandmother:" with more on the subject of seeing as we are seen, and knowing the Saviour as we are known. After the family had breakfasted she received the Lord's Supper, when she desired her daughter and Miss H. to attend. Her breathing was so difficult, that after receiving the elements the service was for a time interrupted, but was at length brought to a conclusion, in which she joined with evident fervour; and, at the close, added an impressive "Amen." She had laboured much since the attack came on for breath. A blister was applied, and other means used, which produced a little ease. Whilst suffering most, she repeated various verses of hymns in broken accents, or by repeating a word or two suggested to the Bishop to take up the subject. She sent dying messages of love to her friends and relations; and blessed her daughter with deep affection. On her daughter saying: "You have been a great sufferer, dear mamma; but what a comfort it is that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; and how small all suffering will appear on looking back from that glorious eternity;" she replied, "How small! and is it not astonishing that we should be rewarded for bearing our sufferings patiently? If I were to chastise my child, and she submit, I should not reward her for it; yet God, through Christ, rewards us." On another occasion, when her daughter said, "What a glorious thing it will be to be free from sin," she said, "Yes! —and from self." She said, in very broken accents, "What is that? I looked, and there was no deliverer; but mine own arm brought salvation." The Bishop repeated the passage as it stands in Isaiah; and it afterwards occurred to him that she had heard Bishop Turner preach some impressive sermons from that text. While taking, with some difficulty, a small portion of arrow-root, she was seized with a convulsive spasm: her eyes became fixed, and those around her were not aware that she was any more sensible. The Bishop and Miss Corrie repeated some passages of Scripture, but she gave no sign of recognition, and continued to breathe hard for about half an hour; when she gradually ceased, and entered into rest, almost during the time her husband was offering the "Commendatory Prayer."

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE insurrection in Canada, appears to be nearly quelled; so that we trust our gracious Queen will not be the third youthful female sovereign whose reign is saddened, as in Spain and Portugal, with a protracted civil war. A bill is in progress for suspending the constitution in Canada, and the Earl of Durham is going out to endeavour to place the affairs of both provinces upon a just and satisfactory basis; but the distractions of party, and the varieties of interest, render the complete success of his mission more to be wished for than confidently anticipated.

The most alarming question pending over England is that of public education. We cannot think it is at present in a satisfactory state, whether as regards its character or its extent. It is far too partial, eleemosynary, variable, and inefficient, to answer its due ends, either secular or religious. But what is the remedy? The legitimate plan would be, to connect public schools, as in Scotland, with the Established Church, upon a satisfactory system; but if this cannot be done, we see but one course, namely, for Lord Denman, Lord John Russell, Mr. Wyse, and the other Lords and Commons who have joined the infidel Central So-

ciety, to leave public education free from the domineering of a central standing board of commissioners; and merely aid what is already in operation, instead of attempting to supersede it. With moderate grants, the Church of England alone could and would educate the whole population.

We have just received from India, but too late to make due use of it this month, a most melancholy document, which proves that if Christians in England do not strenuously exert themselves, all that has been done towards blotting out the guilt of our national encouragement of pagan idolatry will be rendered unavailing. Will be? It has been; —the admirable dispatch of February 1833 is scoffed at; the Madras memorial, signed by 13 chaplains, 37 missionaries, and 152 European civil and military residents, and presented by the beloved Bishop Corrie; the remonstrances of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, urged by the venerable prelate of Canterbury; and of the Church Missionary Society, presented and advocated by its justly-esteemed and respected president; Mr. Poynder's powerful exertions at the India House, with the united prayers of the wisdom, piety, and philanthropy of England, have been contemptuously slighted; and we have now, in the extraordinary document before us, the Governor-general of India, in council, restoring the old abuses and abominations; and this not in an open, manly way, but by directing that "previous decisions or orders," of an ameliorating kind, "shall, without being formally cancelled, be allowed to fall gradually into desuetude." Take one specimen: "The Governor-general, in council, has also expressed his opinion, that *without a formal revocation* of the circular letter issued by order of Sir R. O'Callaghan, prohibiting the attendance of drummers educated at the Wallajahbad depôt, the prohibition should in future be discontinued; and the officers commanding the five regiments to which drummers from that establishment have already been posted, should, *without recalling attention to the subject by any public announcement*, be instructed, *as suitable occasions may offer*, to abstain from a rigid enforcement of the prohibitory order, and thus gradually assimilate the practice, in these five regiments, to that which generally obtains in the rest of the army." Thus instead of emancipating, as we ought, the rest of our soldiery, who may be flogged or shot if they are reluctant to honour the horrible rites of obscene and blasphemous Pagan idolatry, those who, by solemn pledges, were already delivered, are to be trepanned into this grievous bondage by an act of perfidy. We never met with a public document more thoroughly, to use Sir J. Graham's expressive epithet, "shabby." The Governor-general shall not have his ungodly will of these poor defenceless drummer-boys in this underhand manner. He may rest assured there will be such a "public announcement" before long, as shall echo from London to Calcutta. We trust that Mr. Poynder will not fail speedily to call for this faith-breaking edict, in Leadenhall Street; and some religious senator, in Parliament. Mr. Poynder has not been adequately supported; the friends of religion must rally round him, and some member of Parliament must devote himself to the question, or all that has been gained will be lost, and bad will become worse.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

S. B.; HENRICUS; J. B.; W. W.; E. W. F.; J. C.; MINIMUS; F. E. A.; PRESBYTER; A. E., are under consideration.

The Rev. R' M'GHEE's reply to Eubulus in our next.

The Rev. M. A. GATHERCOLE says, that he did not intend his letter in our Number for December for publication, but that in the haste of writing he neglected to make that notification. We are very sorry for it; as we had great reluctance in admitting it.

Page 72, Col. 2, l. 20, of our last Number, for "says Mr. Newman," read "say Mr. Newman." The manuscript and proof-sheet were correct: but the printer's reader, thinking there was a grammatical oversight, altered it as it went to press; thus making us put words in Mr. Newman's mouth, and also spoil our own argument.

A correspondent says: "The *Rev.* H. Dunn in your last Number should have been Mr. H. Dunn. The *Rev.* Mr. Dunn is Secretary to the Home Missionary Society, and is not connected with the British and Foreign School Society."

We are much indebted to many correspondents who have addressed us in terms of great kindness upon the commencement of our New Series; and we hope to avail ourselves of some of their valuable suggestions.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 3. MARCH. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE SANCTIFYING EFFICACY OF AFFLICTION.

For the Christian Observer.

WE look abroad, and see misery pining throughout the dwellings of man, and the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain together. We see the angry elements despoil the fair face of nature of half her loveliness, and with wanton cruelty snatch from famished lips the teeming supplies of this provident mother, until they leave but a few bright fragments of beauty and beneficence to gleam amid a ruin. We see poverty, disease, and pain, embitter enjoyment, and convert animal life into a curse. We see pestilence, and famine, and the sword, desolate the earth with sweeping havoc; while corruption and decay mine their sure though silent course, and unexpectedly introduce amid the pleasing endearments of the domestic scene the dreaded tyrant death, who comes forth, with gloomy horrors and withering scowl, a ruthless and undisputed conqueror.

The heart, sickened at the view, turns inward for repose, but finds no paradise within. There are indeed some noble aspirations after glory, honour, and immortality; there are, in the softer affections, elements of exquisite and intense felicity; there are, too, occasional glimpses, few and far between, as of a paradise; touches of spirit, and quickened pulses of the heart responding, as if vernal breezes breathed upon the soul from brighter and happier climes: but each knows, too well for happiness, the plague of his own heart; and has but too frequent cause bitterly to lament the sorrows of his peculiar lot. And yet, the Architect of this disorganized and crumbling fabric of earth and ashes—the Creator who called into existence this heir of sorrow, could command the resources of the universe—was all powerful and all wise! Why, then, are these things so? The Bible alone can answer this question, and solve this paradox. The apostacy of man alone can reconcile these contra-indications of "the goodness and the severity of God," and satisfactorily account for the opposing phenomena of order and chaos, misery and enjoyment, beauty and deformity. Sin alone can

"Justify the ways of God to man."

But the question then arises, Is the dispensation of suffering, under which man is avowedly placed, penal or purifying? To this not only the character but the word of God testifies, not penal, but purifying.

"All that believe are justified from all things," and "there is therefore now no condemnation," and consequently no penal infliction, "to them which are in Christ Jesus." But sin is a cancer which has eaten into the heart's core, and whose roots must be extracted by the knife and caustic of suffering. All can say with the Psalmist, "Before I was troubled I went wrong:" happy the few who can testify that the cross has done its work; and, with him, add, "But now have I kept thy word."

It is because the present dispensation is not penal but purifying that we often "see the ungodly in such prosperity, and coming into no misfortune like other folk," while those who are walking near to God often walk in darkness and discomfort. Abraham's reply to the rich man, may often be said to characterize the dispensations under which the friends and the enemies of God are respectively placed,—"Remember that thou, in thy life time, receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented."

But holiness is happiness: the salvation is, in fact, the felicity of a soul. What, then, is to be the test and measure of its spiritual progress? Is it sanctification, or is it present enjoyment? To this important question the Gospel answers, Sanctification. The Gospel proclaims as the condition on which it enlists a soul, peace in Christ, in the world tribulation; and as the discipline by which it exercises and trains that soul for glory, a crucifying of the world unto it, and of it unto the world. It is the source from which it springs, and not the mere copiousness of the stream, which gives value to the fountain. The soul embruted in sensuality may sometimes riot undisturbed in base but congenial pleasures: the offspring of God may go mourning all day long, and be in heaviness through manifold temptations. In a scene and a society uncongenial to his higher nature; disqualified by that charity which "seeketh not her own" from contending in the race of selfishness, or buffeting in the rough conflicts of the worldly-minded; exposed by that charity which "thinketh no evil," but "hopeth all things, believeth all things," to the rude assaults of the crafty or unfeeling, and delicately sensitive to the wound; mourning over the sins within him, and the pollution and misery around him—often may the child of God be forced to exclaim, How shall I sing, even the Lord's song, in this strange land? Often, by these waters of Babylon he will sit down and weep, and remember Zion.

As regards God's people, this world is a great hospital, fitted up and provided, not with the luxuries amid which health might fare sumptuously every day, in undisturbed enjoyment, but with the apparatus (often of suffering) necessary to eradicate spiritual disease, and induce soundness of moral constitution. Hence—for sanatory purposes—the derangement of the animal and material world followed immediately the fall of man. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman." "The serpent shall bruise thy heel." "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Hence it has been permitted, by the All-wise and All-gracious Architect, that this habitation of his fallen creatures should be full of discordant elements, which lie far beyond their guiding and controlling power, and whose collision would

desolate the happiest scene, and thus harrow up the soul. Hence too God himself, in the very purposes of his special grace, sometimes lays a withering hand upon the soul, in order that he may repress its untamed ardours, and discipline it to submission. Humiliations are necessary to perfect man in humility, and thus prepare him to fill his appointed station amid the order and harmony of God's universal empire. In a world so circumstanced, the spiritual progress of a soul—that is, the degree of its present salvation—cannot, it is clear, be so fairly estimated by the sensible enjoyment which religion ministers to it, or rather, permits it to derive from the surrounding scene and circumstances, as by the habitual determination of the will, and the stedfast and uncompromising allegiance of the heart to God. There is a growing submissiveness of spirit to the Divine will: there is an ever-deepening humiliation and self-abasement of soul, as the Divine light, shining more brightly upon the Divine word, discloses the more hidden spirit and profounder depths of the Divine mind: there is a simple and unfaltering dependence upon the Saviour—if I may so express it, a determined staking of all, for time and for eternity, upon the person of Christ: there is an aspiring of the soul after glory, honour, and immortality, which would gladly wing its flight from the low scenes of earth to the mansions of spotless purity and undisturbed repose: there is a cleaving of the heart to God, and Christ, and holiness, amid the sharpest conflicts of spiritual temptation, or the darkest frowns of Providence: there are all these, which furnish more unequivocal evidences of its salvation, and a truer standard by which to measure a soul's progress, than the fairest flowers and most grateful fruits which it may perhaps have lingered on its path to enjoy; or than the richest sensible manifestations even of the Divine love—for even these, experience, no less than reason, tells us, God, in the purposes of his love, may indifferently withhold or bestow.

There may, perhaps, be some hardier spirits who can pass through this world of trial untouched by its sorrows, and seem almost exceptions to the general law, that "man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." There may be some who can maintain, amid all its conflicts, an unsubduable faculty of enjoyment; and, still more difficult, who, amid every temptation to set up their rest on earth, can securely nurse an infant principle of immortality. But this is not an exemption generally conceded by religion. The professed object of the Gospel is, by its free mercy, its encouraging promises, its sanctifying discipline, and its supporting aids, gradually to restore a sinner to his original purity; and its declared mode of effecting this is by the slow and painful processes of the crucifixion of the old man, and the regeneration of the soul. Now, from the cross nature revolts, and "a woman when she is in travail hath sorrow."

The theory of religion, as taught in its peculiar doctrines and self-denying precepts; and the history of religion, as recorded in the experience of its most illustrious examples, confirm this truth. They unite in declaring that the great object which the Gospel contemplates for man, in this school for eternity, is not present enjoyment, but sanctification. They tell that the Gospel is a remedial system, and medicines are seldom palatable; no chastening, however salutary and needful, for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous, though afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.

Nor is the consideration of this point merely speculative and unimportant. All who would run with patience the race set before them, and hold the beginning of their confidence stedfast unto the end, should fairly meet the Gospel in this view of it, and "count the cost, lest they begin to build, and are not able to finish;" lest they stagger through unbelief, when they find that the glowing pictures of happiness which the Gospel draws are not immediately realized. The Gospel would indeed immediately realize them, if permitted freely to operate without let or hindrance—if unobstructed by the remainders of sin within their own souls, and by the teeming iniquity of a world that lieth in the wicked one. Religion in the soul is, undoubtedly, a principle of the most perfect, because the purest, enjoyment. But it wages there uncompromising war against sin, in its every shade and character—and sin never strikes its colours; when worsted in open conflict, it retreats fighting to the deep and unobserved recesses of the heart, and there entrenches itself in its strongest fortresses. The warfare is interminable, until mortality is swallowed up of life. The Christian warrior, even when the enemy has for a moment disappeared, must stand to his arms, and keep guard over the citadel of the heart, and expect the foe.

All, therefore, that religion can minister to man's positive enjoyment in this probationary state, is by sometimes suspending its own proper operations, in condescension to his infirmity, and permitting those good things which, in his created innocence, God gave him richly to enjoy, to impart to him their sanctified pleasure. The proper operation of the Gospel is to conform us to the death and resurrection of Christ; and these ends are most frequently advanced by afflictive dispensations of Providence. The Christian indeed finds consolation and enjoyment, not only in laying before the throne of grace his infirmities and sorrows, his wants and praises, but also in the more active exercise of Christian benevolence, in contemplating the rich beauties of the natural world, in the intercourse of sanctified affections, in the commerce of spiritual feelings, in the several charities of public, social, and domestic life. Religion, too, more directly strengthens the soul with the hope of immortality, supports it with consolations of the Spirit, refreshes it with joy in the Holy Ghost, elevates it in breathings after God, expands it in effusions of charity. But all these are, as it were, premature fruits, early ripened upon the still green tree; they are special gifts of free and infinite grace. The proper work of religion, here on earth, is to crucify the old man, and wean the affections from things below. "The disciple is not above his Master;" and, to the spiritual and interior soul, that world which crucified its great Forerunner and Example, can minister but the cross. If the cross is to become the banner of the Christian's victory, it must be first, as with his Divine Master, the badge of his humiliation. This cup cannot pass away from him except he drink it; and the Divine presence, if sensibly vouchsafed, is but to support him under it; the angel from heaven is but to strengthen him to bear it. From the example of his Divine Leader, and by the teaching of His Spirit, he learns submissive resignation and unrepining endurance: he learns to esteem the reproach of Christ more than all the treasures of this mystical Egypt, so as not only to suffer with patience, but to love the cross. The language of his soul, amid outward trials of Providence and internal conflicts of spirit, is "Thy will be done." Thus he finds pre-

sent peace in Christ, and he can look steadily forward to the termination of his probationary course, as the goal of his most ardent wishes, the entrance upon his promised rest. J. M. H.

(To be continued.)

THE REV. R. M'GHEE ON ROMAN CATHOLIC STATUTES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Dublin, Jan. 5, 1838.

I HAVE read, with much satisfaction, a letter in your Number for December, signed "*Eubulus;*" and though the writer rather seems to me to depreciate more than is quite just the arguments which I have prefixed to the Diocesan Statutes of the Roman Catholic Prelates of the Province of Leinster; yet I by no means impute to him any intentional unfairness or hypercriticism, but gladly avail myself of the opportunity which his remarks afford of meeting the intention with which he so very reasonably—and, let me add, kindly—says he penned them, —namely, that I "may be induced to supply the defective parts of my arguments." I will endeavour briefly to do so, if you will be so good to grant this letter a place in your Observer; and if the Statutes reach a second edition, I hope to avail myself more at length of the advice of Eubulus.

Let me, however, premise that I by no means intended the Diocesan Statutes, with the remarks made on them, to furnish a full and explicit statement of the whole case against the Romish bishops. My object was to afford to those who took any interest in the subject, and had attended to the case, the evidence to corroborate those statements already fully before the public, which the Diocesan statutes so unequivocally afforded, and which, in connection with those statements, they so amply supply. I thought it unnecessary to swell the work by a recapitulation of documents already frequently published both in the columns of the public papers, and in printed reports of public meetings; I rather wished to make it as concise as possible. Still Eubulus may fairly remark, that even so the arguments ought to be conclusive, and the proofs clear as far as they go. True; I can only say they seemed so to me, and to others to whom I submitted them; but as it is very possible that a proof may appear conclusive to the mind of a person who is perfectly informed on the subject, and deficient to those who are not so, I shall endeavour to supply the information which Eubulus requires, and to point out those facts which clearly establish the conclusions drawn on the subject.

The first objection which Eubulus makes is on the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council. My argument deduced from the statutes for the proof of this canon was as follows:—

1st. Doctors Murray and Doyle both attempted to explain away its meaning in their evidence before the Committee of Parliament in 1825, saying that it had been a mere enactment of temporal powers.

2d. They endeavoured to deny its existence,—namely, that there ever had been such a canon as that which we receive as the third.—Dr. Doyle's arguments on this latter point I have not now before me; so that I cannot quote his words; the fact I take on the authority of Messrs. O'Sullivan and Phelan's Digest of the Evidence before the

Committee, Part II. 185. Dr. Murray's evidence I have, and his words are as follow:—

"*Question.* Is the authority of the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council acknowledged by the Catholic Church?

"*Ans.* The third canon of the fourth Lateran Council *has no authority whatever in any part of Christendom; it never had any authority in those countries,* and it was made for a particular purpose which has long since ceased. *I should premise that it is exceedingly doubtful whether or not that canon was ever enacted in the Council of Lateran, for no ancient manuscript records it;* but allowing it to have been enacted, it *was done by the civil authorities of Christendom who were there assembled, either by themselves or their representatives.*" (Commons' Committee, p. 591). He then proceeds to give some reasons for this.

Here, I believe, in this prelate's evidence my statement will be allowed to be critically correct,—namely, that "he endeavoured not only to explain away its meaning, but also to deny its existence." I argued from the statutes, that as Dr. Murray quotes the fifteenth canon of that council in them; and as that fifteenth proves, by its numerical order, the existence of the third, for if the third had been blotted out, this fifteenth must have been the fourteenth in order;—so it is clear that Dr. Murray, by his Statutes, admits the falsehood of his own attempt in his evidence to deny the existence of this canon, or to make it "exceedingly doubtful whether it ever was enacted." Eubulus admits that "if Archbishop Murray and Bishop Doyle denied that any such canon was ever in existence—that is, was ever made—they are firmly wedged in by this enumeration." He adds, that I "should have quoted the exact words of their denial." I hope that this quotation will justify my statement as to Dr. Murray, and prove, as Eubulus admits, that he is "firmly wedged in by this enumeration." Dr. Doyle's opinion was still stronger, if I recollect aright, but I have not at this moment means of accurately stating the case. He denied, I think, that this canon was genuine, because it was not found in the Mazarine copy, and was ably refuted by Dr. Magee, archbishop of Dublin.

But as the great object to be kept in view is to exhibit simply the facts, I shall here state that which throws more light on the knavery of these men than anything that I know connected with the subject.

The fourth Lateran Council was held under Pope Innocent III. in the year 1215. This pope died the following year, and was succeeded by Honorius III. A.D. 1216. The third canon of the fourth Lateran Council was published under the order of Honorius, at the coronation of the Emperor Frederic, A.D. 1220, as part of the law of the empire. Honorius died and was succeeded by Gregory IX. A.D. 1227, twelve years after the canon was enacted, and this Gregory compiled the Decretals which form a part of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, which he published about the year 1230; and in these Decretals, lib. v. tit. vii. cap. 13, de Hæreticis, this canon is extant, published as the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council, and not one word of it is omitted. Yet Dr. Murray pretends to deny the existence of a canon because of its not being, he says, in any ancient manuscript, though it was taken by one pope five years after its enactment; and all of it that related to public laws of princes was published as law at the coronation of Frederic; and it was adopted and published by another pope within fifteen years of its enactment in the council, and it remains published in the body

of Canon Law, which is the canon law at this day for all the Church of Rome.

But even this is not all; for in the Council of Trent, sess. 25, cap. ii., it is commanded to "*all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, and all others who, by either law or custom, ought to be present in a provincial council, that in the first provincial synod to be held after the end of this present council* (of Trent), *they shall openly receive all things decreed and defined by the holy synod, and also shall promise and profess true obedience to the Roman pontiff, and shall publicly express their detestation of, and anathematize, all heresies condemned by the sacred canons and general councils;*" and it also commands the same to be observed by all future primates, archbishops, bishops, &c., in the first provincial synod after their promotion. Now the reference in this chapter to the words "*condemned by the sacred canons and general councils*" is to this identical canon *Excommunicamus*, 13, de Hæreticis. The form in which they are to make this profession of obedience and denunciation, is mentioned, and it is the creed of Pope Pius IV.; and Dr. Murray, in the eighth chapter of these Diocesan or Provincial Statutes, commands the same profession of faith to be made as an oath by every beneficed priest in his province, quoting for it the command of the Council of Trent to the same effect, sess. 24, cap. 12; so that while Dr. Murray was giving his evidence, that "it was exceedingly doubtful whether such a canon had been ever enacted," he himself, and his co-adjutor bishops, and every beneficed priest in his diocese, were actually sworn to that identical canon cited by name from their body of canon law, as the standard, or rather the principal standard, of curse and denunciation with which they anathematized us and our religion. These facts I have investigated since the Statutes were published, and they will serve to prove that the argument used by me in my prefatory remarks on the Diocesan Statutes, which Eubulus says is constructive, whatever may be the deficiencies in the arrangement of its premises, is but too well founded in the certainty of its conclusion. The canon cannot in one sense be said to be in full vigour, because the Romish Church has not the power to enforce it; but every bishop and priest is sworn to maintain its principles; and they only wait till the expedient time arrives to bring it as far as possible into operation; for, as Dens says, on a similar subject,—"*Interim non semper expedit Ecclesiam suo jure uti.*"

Eubulus objects against my proofs that Dr. Murray maintains the principles of Dens' theology, that they are "thrown into the declamatory shape of interrogation, instead of being laid down as clear propositions, one by one, in their order, unmixed with other matter." I must again apologize (but I did not anticipate that apology would be necessary) by saying that these statutes were published to throw light on the case for those who have taken an interest in the controversy; and I would observe that the whole tissue of proofs, in the passage which Eubulus quotes, have been again and again drawn out in as close a series of plain syllogistic demonstration as any in which I am capable of laying them before the public. A repetition of these would only have unnecessarily swelled the volume, and wearied readers at all acquainted with the preceding part of the controversy; and to others, who wish to take the trouble of examining it, the proofs are clearly laid down in the reports of the meetings held at Exeter Hall. But I put them here in the shape of interrogatories, with the hope of eliciting some defence from Dr. Murray or his priests. I thought

that perhaps it might be possible to draw them out to the rescue of their statutes, and I have left many openings for them, if they have any thing to say on the subject; but I would submit to Eubulus that if he will be so good as to turn these questions into consecutive affirmative propositions, he will find that they are tolerably conclusive evidence on the subject. Each of them considered as *a question* is certainly a *res probanda*, but each of them has been a *res probata*—a conclusion of many former arguments on the platforms of Exeter Hall, Hereford, Liverpool, and Birmingham.

But I think Eubulus has overlooked one part of the argument on the Statutes, or at least has not kept it clearly in his view in considering the other parts, which would give them a force that they do not now possess in his opinion;—I mean the fact, which is, I think, clearly and unanswerably demonstrated, that Dens' theology was adopted by Dr. Murray and the other bishops, as the standard to which not only the opinions of the priests are to be conformed, but as that by which they are to guide the consciences of the people.

It is perfectly clear that it was made the conference book, not that the priests might be exercised in the mere discussion of speculative points of theology, but that the bishops might be satisfied that they were thoroughly drilled in this book of Standard Divinity; that they might be competent thereby to direct the consciences of the people. The notes on the third and fifth chapters, from page x to xviii, to which Eubulus has not referred, appear to me, who have the documents before me (Dens—the Priests' Directories, Questions, &c.), most irrefragably conclusive.

If Eubulus will be so good as to re-consider the arguments in the notes on those chapters, he will perhaps see more the conclusiveness of those to which he has referred. In remarking on the passage which he quotes, he says,—"Mr. M'Ghee says, 'we find them *asserting* that all heretics, being baptized, are to be compelled by corporal punishments to Popery,'" &c.; and he asks—"Now where do they assert this? Dens, it is true, asserts it; and they use Dens; but they assert that they believe nothing of the sort; that they consider it obsolete; that they hold it in abhorrence."

I beg to refer Eubulus to the passage which he himself quotes, and he will see that he has done me injustice, though I am sure unintentionally, in not quoting again my words fully—they are as follow:—"Accordingly we find these bishops and priests *in this standard theology, which it is so important ever to keep in view, discussing*, in 1832, all the penalties of the Church against heretics; we find them *denying* that there is any true faith in a heretic, Dens, vol. ii. p. 73; *asserting* that heresy is a greater crime than Paganism or Judaism, p. 78; that all heretics, being baptized, are to be compelled by corporal punishments to Popery, and this under the canons of their infallible Council of Trent, p. 80," &c. &c. Now I submit to the candour of Eubulus whether it is not clear from this passage that I state they *assert* this *in this standard theology*, giving as I do the very page to which I refer in Dens; therefore when he says that Dens asserts it, but that they deny it, the only way to test their sincerity is to prove the authority which they ascribe to Dens; and when I have demonstrated that they have set it up as the standard to guide the consciences of the people; that this identical principle is the principle, not only of this authoritative standard, but of a particular canon which they are every man sworn

to hold as infallible, and to obey themselves, and teach all persons subject to their authority to obey, as long as they live, I must say I do not consider it a stretch, either of logical or ethical deduction, to say that they assert this principle in their theology; and I am sorry to add that the proofs are so conclusive in my judgment, that one single word of all their assertions to the contrary has not the weight of a feather in my estimation; for I can prove them in many other instances both to say and to swear what I can demonstrate to be totally contrary to the truth.

But now let me put my interrogatories into the shape of assertions, and let us see whether they do not form a tolerable chain of argument on the case. Dr. Murray excuses himself from holding the doctrines of Dens on intolerance and persecution; he says that these are the obsolete opinions of Dens. Let us put his denial and his statement into comparison with the following facts which are proved:

1st. In the face of his professed liberality to Protestants, he has printed privately, for the use of his priests, in 1831, these Diocesan Statutes, in which we find, as the very first on the list of those who are excommunicated, "heretics and apostates."

2d. We find the crime of heresy a case reserved in these Statutes, as in Dens, for pardon from the pope, or those specially delegated by him.

3d. We find Dr. Murray publishing, in 1832, a code of canon law, taken from a treatise on canon law taught at Maynooth, which Dr. Murray, in his own Pastoral Letter to his clergy, states to have been in much repute in his Church.

4th. We find this canon law added, as supplemental, to a new edition of Dens, and set up, as these statutes prove, with Dens, to be a standard by which the priests are to guide the consciences of the people; and the fact of this canon law, which consists of papal decretals, being published by the command of bishops, puts it into authoritative enactment in the country.

5th. We find, in this canon law, decretals still more persecuting and intolerant than the principles of Dens set up as law for Ireland.

6th. We find by them that heretics are to be dragged from even a church, when proofs sufficient to put them to torture are to be found; and that they are to be tried by the Church, and handed over to the secular power to be put to death.

7th. We find, in this canon law, six papal bulls revived in one single part of it, consisting of two pages, in which the most cruel commands are given for the persecution, torture, and capital punishment of heretics; and we find these, I say, published as the laws for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, by a man who pretends, forsooth, that they are the individual and obsolete opinions of Dens.

We find it, moreover, laid down as the express duty of bishops to exterminate heretics out of their dioceses, only to take care that they do not impede the inquisitors in the discharge of the same laudable occupation; and the authority quoted from the Diocesan Synod of Benedict XIV. is the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council, which Dr. Murray swore, before the Committee of Parliament, to have no authority in Christendom, and on the very existence of which he endeavoured to throw a doubt. So much for Dr. Murray's veracity, in the attempt to prove that the doctrines of Dens are obsolete, and merely his individual opinion.

Now I submit to the candour of Eubulus, and of every reader, whether, *if these be facts*, they are not a conclusive argument on the case; and I have merely turned them from questions into propositions. As to the proofs of them, they have been given again and again and again to the public, and it seemed vain repetition to go through them all in this publication.

With respect to the remarks of Eubulus on reserved cases, they are so far correct as this, that if the individual whose case is reserved chooses to go to confess to the person in whom the power of absolving him is vested, it is quite a voluntary matter on his part to do so. But I did not mean to call this fact in question by my remarks; but only to prove this, that, as the cases reserved are only cases of peculiar enormity—heresy being among them—this proves that the Church of Rome considers this crime as peculiarly flagitious, and that therefore Dr. Murray's pretence of calling heretics "beloved fellow Christians," while his Statutes contained such proofs of the real light in which he held them, furnishes another testimony to the hypocrisy and falsehood of the popish bishop.

With respect to the remarks on the confessional, I am glad to see that Eubulus admits that my arguments, though constructive, are conclusive. Still he considers me wrong in limiting to one class of penitents—namely, to females—the warning which he supposes may equally be intended to apply to all classes. The pages of the Christian Observer are not a field in which to enter on such a subject, so as fully to elucidate the facts. I can only assure my friend Eubulus, that if he had known as much of the case as I do, he would see but too much reason to extend instead of contracting the boundaries of both premises and conclusion. I shall only add, that the words "*solicitatio ad turpia*" are declared in the canon law, published by Dr. Murray in 1832, to be *exclusively limited* to the crime and the penitents to whom I have alluded; therefore I believe he will see that this alone would prove one right on that head; but it is a very small part of the evidence producible on the subject.

Eubulus considers that he must also deduct from the largeness of my conclusion in my reasoning on the collection of priests' dues, and he does not admit that the exaction of them proves the Church of Rome not to be voluntary. He says:—"Though these fees are called dues, and are exacted by spiritual despotism, they are not legally recoverable, so that they are in that sense voluntary, even though extorted by terror." I must confess I differ from Eubulus on this point. If the word "*voluntary*" be taken as contradistinguished from the words "*recoverable by the law of the land*," then the argument holds; but if the word "*voluntary*" be taken as contradistinguished from "*compulsory*," it is not valid. The arguments and flourishes of Mr. O'Connell, for example, on this subject, go on the assumption that the priests are supported voluntarily by the people, that is *willingly*, from love and respect for their instructors; and he opposes this to the reluctant payment of tithes to the Established Clergy. But if it is demonstrated that this is not the case, but that the priests are paid by compulsion, not indeed under the terror of the Court of Exchequer, but under that of a far more formidable sentence before a far more fearful tribunal, the idea of talking of popery as a voluntary system is absurd. It is the most grinding system of exaction and extortion ever practised on any unfortunate people. The principle on which

their dues are wrung from the reluctant grasp of the poor is, that the provision for their priests is one of the six commands of the Church, and if they die violating them they go to hell as dying in mortal sin.

The questions on this subject, quoted from *Butler's Catechism*, (misprinted Batter's), are the same certainly in substance—I believe verbatim—in Doyle's and Reilly's; and these three catechisms are those sanctioned by the National Board, with other books as bad, to be taught in the national schools, as a substitute for the Word of God, to the poor Roman Catholic children. If Mr. Carlisle, or Archbishop Whately, to whom Eubulus appeals, will be so good as to furnish a list of the books of religious instruction sanctioned by their Board to be taught to the Roman Catholic children in the schools over which they preside, they must return these three catechisms; perhaps, indeed, they may undertake to defend them. As to what Mr. Baptist Noel knew, I cannot undertake to say. It is more easy to pronounce, as far as his book supplies information, what he did not know; and to those who take the trouble to peruse it, and who know anything either of Popery, or Protestantism, or the National Schools, or Maynooth, or the Irish Clergy, or the duty of a Christian Church in Ireland, it were quite impertinent to offer any remarks upon the subject.

I beg, sir, again to offer my acknowledgments to Eubulus for his critique. I hope I have in some degree supplied the defects of which he complains; and if the "*statutes*" reach another edition, I shall try to profit by his advice in supplying further information on points with which ordinary readers may not be acquainted. I believe he can procure the reports of the meetings held on the subject of Dens, &c., in Exeter Hall in 1835-6-7, at the office of the Protestant Association there. The documents contained in them will prove every fact adduced in my arguments on the Statutes. I can say most conscientiously, I am not aware of having ever exaggerated one statement as to the Church of Rome. On the contrary, I am compelled to say, that all I have ever said or heard from others on the subject seems to fall far short of the truth. I believe the line of no man's existence is long enough to sound the unfathomable depths of papal iniquity. I humbly trust, sir, that the attention of all who value the blessings of true religion may be roused to the subject; and that all may feel it their duty, in their respective spheres, to use their humble efforts to deliver our poor fellow-subjects and fellow-sinners from the fangs of that anti-Christian apostacy.

I remain, &c. &c.

R. J. M'GHEE.

THE LEADING OBJECT OF CHRISTIANITY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

AT a social party in a happy family, in which subjects of spiritual interest are among the frequent and prominent topics of conversation, the question was asked, "What is the leading object of Christianity?" A clerical friend present replied, "To make men holy and happy." "I should rather express it," said a second, "to bring them back to that holiness and happiness which they lost by the fall of

Adam, and which they regain through the atonement of Christ, and the sanctifying influences of his Holy Spirit." "I fully agree with my brethren," rejoined a third, "that Christ gave himself for us—as indeed the Scriptures expressly teach—that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works; and happiness is undoubtedly restored with holiness; but if I were to speak of the leading object of Christianity, I should say that it is to reveal grace to lost mankind; to shew how God can be just, and yet pardon the transgressor; to answer the question, What must I do to be saved? to speak peace to the guilty conscience, and to point to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world by his expiatory sacrifice."

"All these, then," said a lay friend, "are leading objects?" "No doubt they are," responded the three clerical visitors. "And yet," added an elderly lady, whom all of us looked up to with much veneration, "I have sometimes observed among our reverend instructors a systematic exclusiveness in speaking of the objects of the Gospel. Books and preachers of what are called the Calvinistic class, seem to me generally to render the finished work of Christ most prominent; those of what are called the Arminian class, the progressive work of the Holy Spirit." "And has it fallen to you to observe, in your long and large intercourse with religious persons," said one of the clergymen, "what has been the effect of the two classes of statement?" "I have seen," she replied, "much evil result from a defect or overstatement on either side; as, indeed, might be expected, for to omit any portion of Divine truth must be at least a negative setting forth of error." "And which error, madam, do you think the worst?" "*Both*, sir." We all smiled; but our venerable monitress proceeded: "If I were to ask myself on which side my own chief danger lies, I should be at a loss for an answer. I am so spiritually sluggish, so insensible to the demands of duty, so ready to be satisfied with low attainments, that I need constant exhortations to prayer, vigilance, and self-denial; I require to be alarmed by the terrors of the Lord, and to be told of the awful danger of falling short at the last. And yet, still more, if possible, do I need to be kept from self-righteousness; to be taught more of my guilt and weakness; to look as my ground of hope from what the Holy Spirit, I humbly trust, is doing in me, to what Christ has done for me; to pray, Lord be merciful to me—not a saint, but a sinner. I do not mean to speak egotistically of my own case, but generally of Christians similarly circumstanced. I do not think, my dear friends, that persons in our habits of life are in much danger from the monstrous system of speculative antinomianism; there is not one of us, probably, that ever committed what the world would call a crime: our moral perceptions are on the side of virtue; I do not mean that we act up to them; but as to our system we approve of what is just and honourable, and amiable, and devout; and we readily admit that profligate persons cannot inherit the kingdom of God. When, therefore, we are told that Christianity is the parent of excellence in a world of sin, and a balm for care in a world of sorrow, we respond to these statements; we acknowledge that the bad ought to be good, and the good better, and even the best better still; and we discern much that is refining and elevating in a system which is to carry us on to exalted heights of spiritual perfection. Now, I do not doubt that there is and ought to be this earnest

endeavour to grow in every Christian grace; and quite sure I am that there is peculiar danger to persons in our circumstances from spiritual sloth, and taking the will for the deed in religion. But this is a danger which we can well understand; a danger which we acknowledge and profess to guard against. We are not likely, therefore, to think that a preacher does wrong in speaking of the vivifying power of Christianity, in telling us of our failures, and urging us on to higher attainments. But we may still be so defective in the grace of self-renunciation, that we may shrink from a true portraiture of our ruined and helpless condition as sinners; we may view the cross of Christ chiefly as what we are to carry, and not what we are to cling to; we may too much forget that we need pardon as well as strength; that justification implies acquittal, and that we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith."

Something caused the conversation to take a different turn; but I have repeatedly thought of it, and feel convinced that our matronly instructress was right; I mean with especial reference to the class of persons among whom her own station in life was cast. She had seen some of her dearest friends carried away by that subtle self-righteousness which is especially apt to cling to those whose life has been moral and decorous, as if they did not need as complete a conversion, and as gratuitous a justification, as the profane and profligate; or as if renovation formed the chief, and pardon only a subordinate, element in their salvation. I have heard a most devout and exemplary person say, "I consider the Gospel as intended to build up man's moral nature;" which is, indeed, true; but did my friend forget that it is intended also to shew how a sinner may escape "the damnation of hell?" It may be, that in some schools of theology, the title to the inheritance of the saints in light is dwelt upon so exclusively, that the meetness for that inheritance is not sufficiently urged, and with due minuteness of detail; but in the writings of a large majority of Anglican divines, the danger is on the other side; so that many persons are sincerely endeavouring to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, who have very insufficient views of their guilt and misery; and who, if they should ever come to be plunged in those deep sloughs of spiritual alarm so strikingly depicted by such a rough-weather pilgrim as Bunyan, will find that it is not to Christianity as a sanctifying system *(sanctifying though it is*—for let me not be mistaken) that they must resort in the hour of their exigence. Is this accounted a dangerous sentiment? I fear that its being so accounted is a proof of the truth of my remarks. Some bodies of Christians, and some classes of society, may be differently circumstanced; but in the middle and higher walks of life, among the more devout members of the Church of England, I feel convinced that there is much serious defectiveness of spiritual information, especially in regard to what are truly called the humbling doctrines of the cross. There seems to be a conventional point, beyond which to press the Scriptural statements respecting man's fallen condition and free justification, is thought undignified; such topics must be tenderly handled, so as not to become coarse and sectarian, while no distaste is expressed for the most beautiful delineations of the Christian graces. There are many who laud sanctity, but not spirituality; who admire Ken, but would shrink from Owen; and who have not practically learned that the only solid ground of hope

for the Pharisee of the Pharisees who sat at the feet of Gamaliel, was precisely the same as that which sustained the thief upon the cross. Say what we will, the offence of the Gospel has not ceased; but that offence is not witnessed so much in its elevated precepts as in its humbling doctrines.

A SLOW LEARNER.

ON READING THE LESSONS IN CHURCH BY LAYMEN.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE practice which Zenas urges in your last Number, of laymen reading the holy Scriptures in church to the congregation, is not, I think, lawful; and I feel satisfied that it is not expedient.

First, I think that it is not lawful: for in the service for the ordering of deacons we read,—"Then shall the bishop deliver to every one of them the New Testament, saying, 'Take thou authority to read the Gospel in the church of God; and to preach the same, if thou be thereto licensed by the bishop himself.'" Now if a layman has already this authority, why the solemnity of presenting the New Testament, and ordaining persons to discharge the office?

Zenas has not produced any canonist or ritualist who admits that unordained persons may read the lessons. He says that he will save his readers the trouble of referring to Wheatly, Palmer, and Shepherd, by informing them that they say nothing on the subject. If he only mean that they do not argue the question, he is correct; but may not that be because they did not anticipate that such a question would be raised? I have only Wheatly at hand, whose remarks imply throughout that the lessons are to be read by persons in holy orders. In all that he says upon the subject he speaks of "the minister;" he never intimates that a layman may lawfully officiate here, any more than in other parts of the service; he expressly supposes the same person reading the lessons who was reading the prayers; and he also says, "The Scripture being the word of God, and so a declaration of His will, the reading of it, or making it known to the people, is *an act of authority*, and therefore *the minister that reads the lessons is to stand.*" An act of authority;—clearly so; it is the express authority given in the ordination service to the deacon by the bishop, when he puts the New Testament into his hands. By what warrant, then, does a layman take upon himself this authority? Zenas says that "many laymen would feel honoured in no common degree by being permitted *to convey the word of God to the people;*" but it is an honour which, like the priestly office, no man can lawfully take to himself but "he that is called of God, as was Aaron;" of which calling the visible test and seal in the communion of the Church of England are the Bishop's ordination. Our bishops might indeed revive—and I wish they would—the obsolete office of catechist; which would furnish church officers qualified and authorized to discharge many useful ministrations; and this among the number, if it were thought desirable, and did not interfere with diaconal duties. But then the catechist must make the subscription required by the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh canons, and receive the bishop's licence. It is not a voluntary arrangement between himself and some private clergyman.

Again, the Act of Uniformity enjoins that "When any sermon or

lecture is to be preached, *the common prayer and service* in and by the said book appointed to be read for that time of the day shall be openly, publicly, and solemnly read by some *priest or deacon*." Assuredly the comprehensive words "common prayer *and service*," as prescribed "by," as well as "in," the prayer-book, include the lessons; and the reading is restricted to "some priest or deacon." The next clause excepts "the University churches" from the necessity of the service being first read before sermon (each college having already had private service); but there is no provision that loosens the restriction which confines the reading to priests and deacons.

Another argument deserves consideration. The fourteenth canon enjoins that "all ministers shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, *as well in reading the Holy Scriptures* and saying of prayers, as in the administration of the sacraments, without either diminishing in regard of preaching, [that is, to make more time for the sermon] or in any other respect, or adding any thing in the matter or form thereof." Now it is a maxim of law that every wrong has a remedy; and so it is in this case; for a clergyman, being bound by his canonical oath, and by the Act of Uniformity, and by the laws and usages of the Church, can be duly proceeded against if he is guilty of any ecclesiastical irregularity. But if a layman were, from wilfulness, or defiance, or "in regard to preaching," to curtail the lessons to two or three verses; or to choose to sit, instead of standing, out of opposition to the rubric; or to select the first lesson out of the New Testament, and the second out of the Old; or to read Tobit, or Bel and the Dragon, for a Sunday lesson; no authority, spiritual or temporal, could punish him; for he is not legally bound to obey rubrics or canons; nor is he amenable to any bishop; and all, I presume, that could be done, would be to libel him for "brawling;" which would be just to argue that his reading was itself brawling. He could not be punished for officiating amiss: he must be punished for presuming to officiate at all. But the canon never supposes any but "a minister"—meaning a bishop, priest, or deacon—"reading the holy Scriptures" in the congregation, any more than "saying of prayers and administering the sacraments."

Zenas is doubtless acquainted with the admirable fifth book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, in which the author powerfully and eloquently defends the reading of the Scriptures as a regular portion of the services of the Church of England against Cartwright and his Puritan brethren, who contended that it was a jejune and unprofitable exercise; that ministers had something better to do than to read the Scriptures to the people; that their business was to preach and expound, not to read, which any person could do at home; and this argument has come down from the Puritans, through the Non-conformists, to the modern Dissenters; for it is only of late years that the practice of reading a chapter, or a portion of a chapter, before the sermon, has become common in dissenting places of worship; and even to this hour it forms but a very scanty portion of the exercises where it is introduced, and many of the older ministers and deacons still oppose it as zealously as Cartwright himself. Cartwright had said that the reading of the Scriptures in church was no part of God's ordinary means to save souls; that it was a practice quite unnecessary, and a very great evil in the Church of England; that the sermon was the main object, for that "no salvation is to be looked for where

no preaching is;" and that no more of God's word is necessary to be read than the text which the preacher intends to preach upon or expound; and that to say, as Hooker did, that reading itself is preaching, was absurd; for that, if it were true, "a child of four or five years old is able to preach, because he is able to read." Hooker, on the other side, set forth the great importance of the practice which Cartwright objected to. He says that "With us the reading of Scripture in the church is *a part of our Church Liturgy*, a special service which we owe to God, and not an exercise to spend the time when one doth wait for another's coming, till the assembly of them that worship him be complete;" for Cartwright had admitted that it was convenient to have the Scriptures read "before preaching time"—doubtless meaning by some layman—but not as a portion of the regular service as conducted by the minister. The discussion is very long, but the argument on each side proceeded upon the supposition that the lessons were to be read by the clergy; for if the laity might read them, both Cartwright's objections and Hooker's replies would be beside the mark. Cartwright does not say that laymen officiated, or might officiate, in our Church; but that clergymen were undervaluing their function by doing what a layman, and even a child of four or five years old, could do. Hooker replies, that though it is true that any person who could read might (physically speaking) discharge this office, yet that the function is not less important, or honourable, or worthy of the ministers of Christ, because it requires no special ability. He says: "There is no doubt but that the meanest and worst among the people under the Law had been as able as the priests themselves were to offer sacrifice; but did this make sacrifice of no effect unto that purpose for which it was instituted? In religion some duties are not commended so much by the hardness of their execution, as by the worthiness and dignity of that acceptation wherein they are held with God." He admits that "an infidel, yea, a child, may be able to read;" the inference from which, upon Zenas's hypothesis, would be, "Surely then a pious adult layman may discharge that office in the church;" but instead of this, Hooker argues that those clergymen who could not expound the word of God, discharged their office by reading it. But this argument would have recoiled upon him, if Cartwright could have replied, "Nay; for laymen read the word of God in your churches; so that it is a flimsy apology for your unpreaching clergy, to say that they discharge their peculiar function as ordained ministers, by so doing." May not reading the lessons by laymen, so far from being a legitimate custom of the Church of England, have been a Puritan invention "in regard of preaching?"

The conduct of Sir Thomas More (alluded to by Zenas), in "singing with the singers at high mass and matins," proves nothing as to the legality of laymen reading the lessons in the Anglican Church. The Duke of Norfolk's exclamation, "A parish clerk! a parish clerk!" shews that More was not infringing any function of the sacred ministry, but only discharging the duty of a layman, and, as the duke thought, in a capacity below his rank. The customs of cathedral and collegiate churches which Zenas mentions, I admit, seem to favour the legality of the practice; and yet I think they are rather anomalies than legitimate proofs. Cathedral custom is not always a true index of ecclesiastical regularity. Bishop Burnet complained of what he calls "that indecent way" of "*laymen's reading the litany*" in cathedrals. It was not

only "indecent" but uncanonical; for the fifteenth canon says, that "the litany shall be said or sung...in all cathedral, collegiate, parish, churches and chapels—by the parsons, vicars, ministers, or curates," —there being no permission for laymen to take upon them this office. But if this irregularity was permitted in cathedrals, it is no wonder if laymen were allowed to read the lessons as well as the litany. The anomaly was perhaps connived at, on account of many of the cathedral clergy not being able to chant. With regard to academical chapels, they are private oratories, and may be justly excepted from the general rule. There is great utility, and nothing indecorous, in students reading the lessons within their own walls; but the case is very different in parish churches.

But, secondly, whether the practice in question be lawful or not, it seems to me highly inexpedient. The tendency of Romanism has ever been to make the priest and the church more prominent than the Word of God. Protestantism reversed this; and made the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue a very marked feature of public worship. Now, it would countenance the Romanist view and discourage the Protestant, to lay down a rule that none but ordained ministers may read a prayer in the congregation, but that any person may read the Holy Scriptures. Again: if without the bishop's authority a pious and well-instructed layman may thus officiate, there is nothing to prevent an ignorant and an ungodly one, or even a parish school-boy; and thus great indecorum might arise, and much disparagement, in popular estimation, to the sacred oracles. The multitude, who judge by visible indications rather than by the hidden reasons of things, would be apt to conclude that what the clergyman read was more solemn than what was read by one of their unordained neighbours. Dissenters, also, would have a dangerous sophism in their hands, if they could persuade the people that the clergy thought more reverently of their own book than of the book of God. So far, therefore, from admitting with Zenas—though I honour his zeal and his motives—that the lessons should ever be relegated to laymen, I should rather that the reading of them were regarded as the privileged office of a bishop or senior clergyman being present and taking a part in the service; and I believe, that in some cathedrals a prebendary or canon reads the lessons, though a minor canon was otherwise officiating. So, also, in the communion service, the higher or elder minister very properly reads the commandments and the Gospel.

ARTEMAS.

ON WRITTEN AND UN-WRITTEN SERMONS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I AGREE with A. B., in your Number for January, that a discussion, in your widely disseminated and much-esteemed work, on the advantages and disadvantages of extempore preaching, might be useful; and as he seems to invite remarks upon his letter, I beg leave to offer a few. A. B. affirms that a discourse, spoken extemporaneously, will generally have "more of what is called unction" than a written one; that it will be characterized by more earnestness, and will therefore produce a greater effect upon the auditory. Now, I would with all deference ask what he means by the words unction and effect? If he means

that the unction of the Holy Spirit will be more certainly and decidedly imparted to an extemporaneous than a written discourse, it appears to me at least a sort of limiting His gifts "who divideth to every man severally, as He will." And if, by effect, he means an enlightening effect upon the understanding, or a converting effect upon the heart—such an effect upon the auditory, or any other good and lasting effect, does not, in the slightest degree, depend upon a discourse being delivered extemporaneously or otherwise; but solely and entirely upon the blessing of God, and upon the power of the Holy Spirit in carrying home the word preached to the hearts and consciences of the hearers.

With respect to what he says respecting not titillating the public ear, and acquiring a vain popularity as pulpit orators, I apprehend that the practice which he recommends, especially by our younger brethren, naturally tends to produce these most undesirable results; neither do I believe that it will (according to his opinion) "render men more efficient and able ministers;" or that they will, on that account, find their labours more blessed; or that, by so doing, "they will more signally promote the glory of God and the salvation of men."

Your correspondent affirms that "nearly all the ministers of the various dissenting denominations preach extemporaneously." Now, supposing this to be the case, I do not see that the effects produced by their style and manner of preaching are such as to make the clergy of the Established Church very anxious to copy them. But I have reason to believe, from facts which have come incidentally under my knowledge, that many dissenting preachers only appear to preach extempore; and that they are in the habit of committing, sometimes their own previously written discourses, and sometimes the written or printed discourses of others, to memory, though the latter course is against their rules. Upon this mode of preaching your correspondent has the following remark:—"But I would not recommend him to write out a sermon and deliver it *memoriter*, which is probably the *worst*, as well as the most laborious, of all the modes that can be adopted." Now if he means the writing out of another person's sermon and committing it to memory, I perfectly agree with him. But if his objection be to a clergyman's composing his own sermon, and then preaching it memoriter, I see little or no force in it. Such a practice appears to me to include the advantages, and to get rid of the disadvantages, of both the usual modes of preaching. It gives the minister the advantage of addressing his flock with all the earnestness and animation of an extemporary preacher, and thus equally fixing their attention. His quotations from his Bible (which he takes with him into his pulpit) will seem to arise more naturally out of his subject; an opportunity is afforded him of making any observations which may strike him at the time as being important, or illustrative of his subject; and yet he is, at the same time, restrained from rambling and digression, and exempted from that exceedingly tiresome accompaniment of extempore preaching—tautology. The almost only solid objection to this mode of preaching seems to lie in the time occupied in committing a sermon to memory. This, of course, will greatly vary, according to the peculiar talent or ability of the individual—though in this, as in many other things, perseverance in the practice will convert mountains into mole-hills. I have myself, for some years, adopted this practice, and have committed to memory upwards of five

hundred sermons of my own composing, and have preached them memoriter. To commit a sermon of half an hour's preaching to memory, occupies me about three hours—sometimes less. And having done this, I occasionally put it in my pocket, and refresh my memory while walking out, or visiting my parishioners. And I cannot see that the time thus occupied (in meditating upon the important truths which I have to inculcate on my flock the following Sabbath) is lost or mispent.

F. E. A.

*** It is not for us to be umpires among our correspondents; and we have no wish to dissuade F. E. A. from a practice which he finds convenient and useful; but there is an objection to the memoriter method greater than that of the severe labour which it requires, and which Bishop Burnet says, in his Pastoral Care, "is so vast that it is scarce possible that a man can be able to hold up long to it;" though the bishop adds, and we think with great justice, that "a young beginner" will do well "to get by heart" some sermons on the chief topics of the Gospel, for the sake of furnishing himself with a good stock of theological argument and illustration; but this advantage is extraneous to the particular point at present under discussion. The example of not a few of the continental preachers proves that the memoriter practice may be highly impressive; and if every clergyman could commit a sermon to memory in three hours or less, the labour would not be onerous; but all men have not that facility; and we remember once trying, as an experiment, during a whole week, to learn one of our own Family Sermons by heart, as it is called, but found that we could write several new ones with far less fatigue than would enable us to repeat one old one. But even were the practice less laborious—in most cases it is hopelessly so—there would be the objection to it, that not being the usual custom in England, it wears in public estimation the aspect of insincerity. We remember the case of a young Dissenting minister, many years ago, who delivered, without a shred of notes, a sermon which was much admired for its orderly arrangement, its noble thoughts, and its beautiful language; all which were concluded by the audience to be the present outpouring of his heart and mind, after diligent study, meditation, and prayer, but without his being tied down to words and syllables. But happening afterwards to preach the same discourse elsewhere in the very same words, some of his former auditors being present, strong terms of disgust were uttered at his supposed duplicity, and we question whether he ever re-instated himself in the good opinion of his critics. The popular impression, when a clergyman enters a pulpit with a Bible and without a written sermon, is, that he is delivering extemporaneously what he has prepared—it may be with much care, and even have written down—but not learned verbatim by rote; and great allowance is made for the defects of extempore speaking. But if it comes to be suspected that there was nothing extempore in the matter, but that the admired voluble fluency was the outpouring of a retentive memory, an audience is apt to consider itself imposed upon, and to regard the preacher as acting a part. Upon the continent, where the practice is usual, this effect does not follow; but in England a clergyman who repeats a written sermon should not be ashamed to exhibit it—though he may not have occasion to use it—lest he should seem to be covertly seeking to be admired for his ready utterance; unless, indeed, his practice is sufficiently known and avowed—as doubtless it is in the case of our correspondent—so that his congregation are aware that he is not preaching under false pretences.

REMARKS ON DR. PUSEY'S ACCOUNT OF ECCLESIASTICAL INNOVATIONS AT OXFORD.

(*Continued from p.* 114.)

For the Christian Observer.

WE offered some general remarks in our last Number upon Dr. Pusey's letter to Mr. Townsend, in relation to certain ecclesiastical innovations at Oxford. As Mr. Townsend says that he cannot point out any erroneous statement on the subject in our pages, and as Dr. Pusey's own admissions amply corroborate our remarks (which had reference to principles, rather than to the numerical amount of innovation), we have nothing personally to defend or explain; nor are we required to go into the question whether, quoad Mr. Townsend's statements, Dr. Pusey has given a satisfactory answer; so that we could be well content to leave the matter where it is; but as Dr. Pusey has alluded to several particulars of detail, it might be thought that we evaded his arguments if we did not notice them.

There is some difficulty in lucidly arranging our remarks, because, though Dr. Pusey has adduced six heads, yet the last three are but subdivisions of the second; so that in following him we must either inconveniently anticipate, or needlessly repeat. The general principle and the details are also blended; and the order and numbering of the heads in his discussion do not comport with the order and numbering as proposed by him in the introductory specification; which we will quote, adding in parentheses the paragraph numbering, which we follow, as he has perferred doing. He says:—

"The charges supposed to allude to the Oxford clergy are,—1. That they have set up their notions of primitive antiquity against the rubrics of their own Church; 2. that they have introduced what their congregations must look upon as innovations; and as instances of these have, 3. (4.) added a cross to the surplice; 4. (6.) placed the bread and wine on a small additional table; 5. (3.) introduced needless bowings; and 6. (5.) unusual attitudes of devotion."

I. Dr. Pusey gives as follows Mr. Townsend's first allegation and his own reply:

"And first, the whole gravamen of the charge is, the preference of 'primitive antiquity' to the rubrics of their own church; or, as you afterwards said, 'reviving the usages of antiquity among us,' in opposition, as it would seem, 'to the ordinances of their church.' This would be a serious charge: the fact is, that no one clergyman in or near Oxford has done any one thing as 'being justified by primitive antiquity;' but that whatever has been done, has been done in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice. This, of course, alters the whole character of the charge."

Here are two things asserted; first that the innovations are not actuated by deference to catholic antiquity, but by a spirit of conformity to the Church of England; and secondly, that in point of fact "what has been done has been done in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice."

1. With regard to the first of these, which is simply *a question of motives*, we have no wish to be arbiters between Dr. Pusey and Mr. Townsend. Our own statements have always taken a middle, and we believe the true, line of remark; not that the innovators wilfully violate Anglican rubrics in deference to antiquity; but that, from their deference to antiquity, they misconstrue both the spirit and the letter of our formularies, and draw them aside from their Protestant meaning; and where they cannot do this, that they censure them as perverted

by the rationalistic bias of the Reformation. No person has averred, for example, that Dr. Pusey uses chrism and exorcising in baptism; but he strenuously vindicates these and other superstitious ceremonials upon the express ground of antiquity; and laments their disuse in the Church of England, which he imputes chiefly to the ill-omened influence of the foreign Reformers. In one of his pamphlets published with his name in the Tracts for the Times, speaking of the superstitious and unscriptural prayer for the dead, which our Reformers, in their imperfect emancipation from Popery, had unhappily allowed to remain in the first Liturgy of King Edward, though they were enlightened from above to exclude it in the second, he says, "It argues no tendency to Popery if any one wish that our Reformers had in this and other points *for which they had the authority of the early church*, adhered to their first judgment." Is not this "the preference of primitive antiquity to the rubrics of their own church?" though we do not charge Dr. Pusey with breaking those rubrics by inserting the abandoned clause in his official ministrations. But why adduce specific quotations, when the whole tenour of the Oxford Tracts, and the dolorous lamentations of which we have heard so much of late over the grievous defectiveness and Protestant bias of the Anglican Articles and Homilies, together with the panegyrics on the Popish breviary,—all prove the truth of Mr. Townsend's charge, if only it be confined to predilections and practical innovations, without asserting that there was an express design to violate Anglican rubrics. "

We will give an illustration of our meaning in regard to two usages which Dr. Pusey himself admits have been introduced or revived at Oxford. Some months since a letter was published in the British Magazine, under the signature of H. Coddington, in reply to our remarks upon Oxford innovations*. The writer says:—

* The subordinates of the British Magazine are frequently nibbling at the Christian Observer, though the Editor has twice courteously apologized for their so doing against his instructions; but the opening remarks of Mr. Coddington were so unjust and ungentlemanly, that the Editor owed a third apology to himself and his readers, for allowing his pages to be disgraced with them. We are quite sure that the Editor of the British Magazine as little doubts that the writers in the Christian Observer are conscientious in their disapprobation of the doctrines of the Oxford Tracts, as we do that he is conscientious in upholding them, if he does uphold them. Why, then, allow his correspondents to impute base motives? and motives as absurd as they are base? No man ought to know better than the Editor of the British Magazine that this is not a Christian or a scholar-like course. Mr. Coddington's affectation, in alluding to the Christian Observer as "a periodical of the religious class" which he "will not help to save from extinction by naming it" in the pages of the British Magazine, is pardonable, as he probably was not aware, though any bookseller could have told him, that the circulation of the publication in which he was writing falls far short of that of its cotemporary: and that while the latter has kept up, with far less than the ordinary fluctuations of periodical works, during a long series of years, the rapid decadence of the former, even in its fresh juvenility, has been almost unparalleled. It is really not in good taste for the British Magazine to provoke such paltry comparisons. Let it keep its own path, and we will keep ours; and the world is wide enough for both, and for divers more. We have refrained from inserting many papers which have been sent us from time to time, animadverting upon statements in that and other magazines, because we have observed that party-spirit is apt to be imputed, even where it does not exist, in discussions carried on between two parallel publications, and thus a great impediment is interposed in the way of truth; so that where a topic can be as profitably handled without this collision, the least controversial course is the best.

"The two points to which I mean to allude here are the restoration of the ancient stole or scarf, as a part of the liturgical dress of a deacon, and the practice of reciting the prayers of the morning and evening service at the rails of the altar.

"As to the former matter, it is sufficiently notorious that the leading principle of our Reformation was a determination to return to the old paths of primitive Christianity, from all the corruptions and innovations which had from time to time been introduced into our Church by the adherents of the See of Rome. Our reformers departed from this rule in some few particulars, where they found that usages, in themselves allowable and proper, were so perverted by the superstitious as to make them at that time prejudicial to the Church. Of this kind were, probably, many of the canonical articles of dress of the clergy. It seems, however, but natural to suppose that the same principles which enjoined the disuse of such articles or practices under those circumstances, would direct the restoration of them as soon as the objection was removed. In the present condition of our Church, prevented from legislating for herself in matters of this kind, *it seems hard to tie every clergyman down to an exact conformity with what has been expressly authorized, when he has good evidence to produce from orthodox catholic antiquity for some apparent innovation in such a point as a stole or scarf*, especially if his own bishop has not expressed disapprobation of his conduct. It might, however, be wise to abstain from any thing *very unusual, for fear of offence to the unlearned;* and therefore a plain black scarf might, probably, be more advisable than a piece of ribbon with a St. Andrew's cross worked on it, which some of the Oxford deacons are stated to adopt.

"With regard to the recital of the prayers at the altar rails, it seems *at variance with primitive custom*, at least according to Bingham, who places the *ambo* at the lower end of that part of the nave of the church, appropriated to the faithful, and to the fourth order of penitents, who were allowed to stay and hear the prayers of the Church."

Now let the reader weigh well this letter, and mark its tone of argument. Our Reformers prohibited certain usages because they were "perverted by the superstitious;" but nevertheless "it seems hard to tie every clergyman down to an exact conformity with what has been expressly authorized (that is, to the rubrics of the Anglican church), *when he has good evidence to produce from orthodox catholic antiquity* for some apparent innovation in such a point as a stole or scarf." Mr. Coddington, indeed, thinks that his Oxford friends should abstain from anything "very unusual"—not for fear of violating the rubrics of the Church of England, which it is very hard for learned Oxford divines to be tied down to, when, as they suppose, they have "orthodox catholic antiquity" on their side; but merely "for fear of offence to the unlearned." Our readers may remember, that in our Number for last August we proved, unlearned as we were, that the resumed diaconal vestment or decoration was excluded from the ecclesiastical articles, permitted or enjoined by the Church of England; and what is Mr. Coddington's reply? He cannot deny that we were right; and he thinks it "more advisable" not to adhere to this "very unusual" vestment "for fear of offence to the unlearned;" but he at the same time complains bitterly of being thus tied down by Anglican rubrics, though he cannot deny that they were intended to prevent usages "perverted by the superstitious."

Again, with regard to "reciting the prayers at the altar rails," with the clergyman's back to the people, what is Mr. Coddington's reason for recommending the readers of the British Magazine to abstain from this popish practice? Is it that it is contrary to the rubrics of the Church of England?—No, but that "it seems at variance with primitive custom;" so that there is no hardship in relinquishing it.

2. We could have gone on to fill many pages with proofs that deference to supposed catholic antiquity is far more talked of by certain of these innovators than the plain unsophisticated meaning

and spirit of Anglican ordinances. But it is time that we should proceed to the second consideration suggested by Dr. Pusey's first head,—namely, that whatever may be the motives, the *result* is not, as he says it is, "in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice." Will Dr. Pusey tell us what rubric or canon Mr. Newman followed at Littlemore in erecting a cross, in the popish fashion, over the communion table; or Mr. Dodsworth, in setting up images and other decorations, which he was obliged to pull down before his church was consecrated? Will he point out the rubric for the deacon's stole and St. Andrew's cross? Will he tell us what rubric is obeyed in a clergyman's reciting the daily prayers with his face to the altar, and his back to the people? Will he shew us what rubric or canon enjoins the introduction of a side table at the holy communion as preparatory to "the altar?" Will he specify what rubric canonized Bishop Ken, and recommended the twenty-first of March to be kept to his honour? Will he say what rubric forbad the use of the fifth of November service? Will he tell us what rubric Dr. Hook obeyed when he poured out the wine (which he superstitiously, and contrary to the Anglican rubric, called "the blood of Christ"), upon "a consecrated pavement," when the old-fashioned prayer-book rubric directed that it should be used by the communicants, not more being consecrated than is necessary?—It is, therefore, we must say, a most incorrect statement, that "what has been done has been done in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice."

We will shew, by another illustration, how little, in point of fact, these innovators obey Anglican rubrics when they wish to conform to antique customs. It is enjoined, as we have seen, by the rubric, that "the morning and evening prayer shall be used in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel;" and that "the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past;" and that "such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof" shall be used as were used "by the authority of parliament, in the second year of king Edward VI." There have long been certain well-known and settled practices in these matters, which the clergy of the Church of England esteem strictly rubrical; they have not, for example, worn deacon's stoles with St. Andrew's crosses, or knelt at the communion rail with their backs to the people, but made use of the reading-desk which the canons direct to be provided, and which Wheatly and other ritualists affirm to be "the accustomed place." If, however, some divine begins to think that the universal practice from time immemorial might be amended, and made more conformable to catholic antiquity, by a novel, or newly-revived, interpretation of certain rubrics, what course does the Church prescribe? "Forasmuch," says the Church, "as nothing can be so plainly set forth but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same, to appease all such diversity, if any arise, and for the resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this book, the parties that so doubt, or diversely take any thing, shall always resort to the bishop of the diocese." Now, have the innovators whom Dr. Pusey defends done this? They do not allege that they have; and we ourselves know of instances in which they are following these novelties, or restorations, or be they what they may, in opposition to the opinion of the bishop. Is this regular and rubrical?

Again: take as an instance the recent omission of the appointed

service for the fifth of November, by certain divines who object to the Protestant succession as enacted in 1688. They argue that the Prayer-book as we have it, is not the Prayer-book as it ought to be; that in the very same service, part is binding upon us because it was decreed in convocation; and part not, because it was only enjoined by royal authority; that we are tied to what relates to the Papists' plot, but not to the thanksgivings for the accession of King William*. Now when this "doubt" arose in their minds, thereby prompting to "diversity" of conduct, did "the parties that so doubt" apply, as the Prayer-book requires, to their diocesan for the resolution of their difficulty, and follow his monition? It is not alleged that they did so. They argued the case in magazines and newspapers, and carried the matter with a high hand; omitting what they themselves allow to be binding, because it is mixed up with what they dislike. Indeed it is

* Dr. Sacheverell did not venture, in his day, to omit the fifth of November service, which would have been a hazardous experiment; but he preached and published a sermon at St. Paul's contradicting it, for which, and his Derby sermon, he was impeached. The attorney-general said upon the occasion:

"The other sermon was preached at St. Paul's, London, on the fifth of November, which is a day set apart for a general day of thanksgiving for two very great deliverances vouchsafed to this nation, by the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, and the arrival of his late majesty, King William, to redeem us from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power. My Lords, when ye come to hear this sermon read, I am confident that it must appear very strange to find that, when there were two such memorable occasions for the doctor to have set forth his eloquence in a thanksgiving sermon, he should in great measure pass by both the businesses of the day, and entertain his audience with a long harangue of the deplorable condition the church was in, not so much from Papists, the avowed enemies of the Church, as from her pretended friends, as he calls them, the false sons of the Church, who were crept into her bowels, and shewn themselves to be perfidious brethren, by defending toleration, and liberty of conscience, and favouring the Dissenters. And to shew his little liking of the great work which was begun to be wrought on that day, by the arrival of his late majesty, the chief turn of his discourse is to cry up non-resistance and passive obedience."

Several of the Lords and Commoners who delivered their sentiments at Sacheverell's trial, entered very much into the question of divine right and passive obedience; admitting fully that both these doctrines are Scriptural, and that they are upheld—as assuredly they are—in the Homilies of the Church of England; but that rights and duties are reciprocal; that King James had abdicated the throne; moreover, that he had broken the stipulations under which, by divine right, he held it, and that "the Lord, therefore, had set him aside from being king;" that the revolution of 1688 was not rebellion, but legal and scriptural transmission; and further, that the doctrine of the Bible is that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" which complex phrase takes in the whole frame-work of civil government, as established in the course of divine providence in every country; so that, if any one member of "the powers that be" endeavours to put down the rest, he breaks the ordinance of God, and is to be opposed as an evil doer, while the doctrine of divine right and passive obedience, so far from being contravened, is acknowledged and acted upon by this support of the ordinance of God against its violator. Divine right and passive obedience, it was argued, extended to the relation of parents and children, as much as to that of monarchs and subjects; but if the parent wished to force Popery upon his children, they were bound to resist. It was added, that the scriptural institution of civil government must be maintained, even to the disobeying or coercing of any one member of it; as if, for example, a king became deranged in his mind, and proved himself unfit to hold the sceptre.

We merely state the arguments, without commenting on them. It is somewhat curious that this very controversy is revived at Oxford (and most gratuitously and unnecessarily) more than a century after, in consequence of Dr. Pusey's fifth of November sermon; a reply to which has been published, following out the very *per contra* arguments urged at Sacheverell's trial.

a well-known fact in the annals of the Church of England, and the records of convocation amply illustrate it, that the class of divines who have affected to be higher churchmen than their brethren, have always been inclined to contumacy when their bishop has not been of their way of thinking. We know of no modern instance of a presbyter acting so offensively towards his diocesan as Dr. Hook towards the meek and saint-like Bishop Ryder, because the bishop supported the Bible Society, which the presbyter did not choose that he should do unmolested. We are not writing of private or local transactions, but of Dr. Hook's published declarations, which were upheld and lauded at the time, in so called "high-church" publications, as most praiseworthy rebukes of a peccant bishop. The reader may refresh his memory by turning to our volume for 1830, p. 615. We will quote a few lines for those who have not the volume, because they shew by what a frail thread such divines hold their reverence for bishops who oppose their own views.

"In the Christian Remembrancer, after all this shew of passive obedience to episcopal authority, because it happened to be in the case of a bishop (the Bishop of Ferns) who opposes the above-mentioned (Bible, Church Missionary, and Jew-conversion) societies, and used means not authorized by law to effect his object, we meet (in the very next leaf) with a most unjustifiable 'defiance' to another prelate, the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, merely because he presumed to exercise his own judgment, not constraining his clergy to follow his example, but leaving them to the most free volition, and without the slightest imputation of injustice, unkindness, or partiality, being capable of being urged against him. He saw fit, in the exercise of his judgment, and according to the dictates of Christian love, enlightened wisdom, and true episcopal zeal in the service of his Divine Master, to attend a Bible Society meeting at Coventry. For thus using his liberty, forcing no other man to do as he did, he is attacked in a manner the most undutiful, uncanonical, disrespectful, and uncalled-for, in a letter published in the common newspapers, by Mr. Hook and his curate, who threaten him that if he presumes to preside at the Bible Society meeting at Coventry, they will '*render him obnoxious to the censures of their parishioners,*' for supporting that Society '*in opposition to our wishes, and in spite of our well-known principles;*' and they pray God 'to send him a wise decision on the subject.' And this obtrusive and supercilious epistle from two private clergymen to their diocesan, the Christian Remembrancer inserts 'for the consideration of every true Churchman.'"

We do not suppose that either Dr. Hook or the Christian Remembrancer, upon looking back, would defend such conduct; and we only adduce it as a by-gone instance, with a view to shew that a zealous profession of what are called high-church principles, is no proof that a clergyman will reverence his diocesan's opinion when it does not concur with his own.

II. Dr. Pusey's second head from Mr. Townsend is as follows: "That they have introduced what their congregations must look upon as innovations;" in reply to which, he says, that so far from it, "No one alteration has been made in any one church or chapel in or near Oxford;" and that whatever has been done "has been done in *new* churches or to *new* congregations; so careful have these clergy been not to startle their congregations by anything to them an innovation."

This reply is not worthy of Dr. Pusey; and we are astonished that it should have contented Mr. Townsend. Mr. Townsend had said that "several of our brethren in the south, believing themselves to be justified by the customs of a primitive antiquity, have lately made alterations which must by the people of their congregations be regarded as innovations, and which have begun a new era of observances of very questionable utility in the church." The point of his argument is, that however well satisfied these "brethren in the south"

may be that they are justified in their customs, still, to "the people of their congregations," that is, to the community in general, who are not aware of their learned reasons, these things will seem to be innovations. If in a thousand parishes the deacon's stole with St. Andrew's cross, the cross over the "altar," the subsidiary table in the chancel, and the saying the prayers retroverted at the communion rail instead of in the reading-desk, were introduced, these things—even admitting, for the sake of argument, that they are strictly proper—would be popularly considered as new practices, not justified either by usage or rubrics. Mr. Townsend's argument asserts this, and no more. Now what is Dr. Pusey's reply? It is, that no change has been made *in the same church to the same congregation*. The innovations or restorations, he says, have been introduced either in new churches, or in a service newly commenced in old ones. Certain unwonted observances have been adopted, for example, in Mr. Newman's new church or chapel at Littlemore, which is connected with St. Mary's parish, Oxford; and in the new church of St. Paul's, and at the additional daily service at St. Mary's; but because two of these churches are new, and the service in the old is a new service, Dr. Pusey, confining himself to the mere words of Mr. Townsend's argument, and keeping out of sight their meaning, affirms that "No one alteration has been made in any one church or chapel in or near Oxford;" and hereupon Mr. Townsend makes his bow, and begs pardon for his mistake. "No one alteration;"—what can be more satisfactory? But analyse the real meaning. For example, Mr. Maurice says that Mr. Newman has erected a cross over the altar at Littlemore. Is that usual or rubrical in the Church of England? Is it not an innovation? Oh no; it is not an innovation; there is no "alteration;" for it is a *new* church. Again: does Mr. Newman say the prayers at St. Mary's in the manner described? Is not that a new practice, and in an old church? Oh no; he does not say them so on Sunday; but only at an additional daily service, which not having been in use before there is no "alteration." Thus we see that a new church is a free field for innovation; and also a new service at an old one; "so careful have these clergy been," says Dr. Pusey, "not to startle their congregations by anything *to them* an innovation."

We repeat that this is unworthy of Dr. Pusey. When Mr. Townsend wrote of "alterations" he clearly meant deviations from the customary manner of solemnizing Divine worship in the Church of England; but Dr. Pusey has seen fit to construe the charge in a manner that makes both the accusation and the reply perfectly absurd. If the commander-in-chief of her Majesty's forces were to write to two officers to say that he understood they had made alterations in her military establishment, by clothing their soldiers in Oxford gowns, and arming them with New Zealand pikes instead of muskets, would it be a rational reply to say that "No one alteration has been made; for the one was a new regiment, and in the other, which was an old one, only the new recruits were thus equipped?" We do not mean, or believe, or insinuate, that Dr. Pusey intended to write anything approaching to falsehood or prevarication; but his words have had all the effect of deception to cursory readers. It is within our knowledge that it has been said: "Who, after this, would believe one word in the Christian Observer? Dr. Pusey solemnly asserts that '*No—one—alteration* (every term is pointedly emphatic) has been made in

any one church, or chapel, in or near Oxford.' He denies the statements *in toto*; and Mr. Townsend, upon reading this solemn denial, acknowledges that he has been misled."

But we must not allow this strange defence to pass by thus cursorily; though it is open to objections too numerous for us to rehearse. It virtually lays down the position that the same clergyman may lawfully solemnize Divine service in a different method every day in the week, and yet there be no violation of rubrics or uniformity. But we contend that if Mr. Newman believes himself constrained by the rubrics to officiate in a certain manner on Monday and Tuesday, he wilfully violates them by officiating otherwise on Sunday and Wednesday; and if he does not consider himself so obliged, he breaks the unity, and disturbs the peace, of the Church without reason. Then, again, the practice which Dr. Pusey eulogizes—and we doubt not with perfect good faith—appears to us to be neither straight-forward nor candid. If the practices are right, and such as ought not to be pretermitted, why introduce them only "in new churches, or to new congregations;" as if to insert the sharp edge of the wedge where it will be least observed, in order that by and by it may be driven home, and split asunder the whole of our ecclesiastical communion; for this would, too probably, be the result, as it was in the days of Archbishop Laud. If these divines feel satisfied that they are right, let them, with Christian boldness, introduce their alleged restorations in the most public services, and on the most public days, so that the questions may be fairly brought to an issue before the appointed ecclesiastical authorities; and let them not by little and little insinuate their practices in such a manner as "not to startle their congregations;" till, having thus cautiously multiplied their places of strength, they shall think themselves sufficiently powerful to invest the whole of our churches and parishes. Many persons suppose that these divines have come forward with all the incautiousness of simplicity; whereas Dr. Pusey now admits that they have confederated (for all could not have followed precisely the same plan by mere accident) to introduce their plans only "in new churches, or to new congregations," in order "not to startle their congregations;" and we fully believe that if a few individuals and periodical publications had not "startled" the public by announcing what was in progress, the evil might have worked its way, till it became irremediable. The contest is now happily in the face of day; and our hope and prayer are, that truth will prevail, whether it be found on the one side or the other of antagonist principles.

But still further, what does Dr. Pusey mean by "new churches and new congregations?" We know of no such things as new churches, in the sense of churches in which practices may be introduced which are not lawful or expedient in the old. All are but parts of one mighty whole; and unity and uniformity should be its characteristics. It will perhaps astonish some who suppose that the writers of the Oxford Tracts are peculiarly anxious for regularity, to learn that Dr. Pusey vindicates the system of new churches having one rule, and old ones another; and the congregation of to-day having different forms from that of to-morrow.

But, once more, what is meant by "different congregations?" Are congregations thus segregated? Have none of the parishioners at Littlemore ever seen or heard of a clergyman in a reading-desk, so

that Mr. Newman and his curate retroverted, and kneeling before the cross-surmounted altar, present to them their first virgin notions of an Anglican priest, and the daily Anglican service? And is there stationed at the porch of St. Mary's a verger to see that no person enters the church on Monday who had been there on Sunday; or, *vice versa*, in order that the new practices may be confined to the new congregation; and the old to the old, so that no man may be "startled?" And is this ecclesiastical police to be introduced into all the new and old churches throughout the land; so that no man who ever saw the one practice shall ever, by any chance, witness the other? And yet more, must none of the members of the new and old church, or the new and old congregation, or the Sunday and the week-day worshippers, ever be permitted to meet in streets, or shops, or drawing-rooms, so as to ask one another, why Littlemore is not like Greatmore; and St. Mary's on Sunday, like St. Mary's on Monday; and why Mr. Newman cannot conscientiously do on Thursday what he does on Wednesday? So far from the plan which has been adopted not "startling" the people, it is of all plans most calculated to do so, even to the utter confusion of all their ecclesiastical conceptions. Two clergymen may differ upon some points of ritual observance, and the people not be scandalised, as they will readily allow for conscientious varieties of opinion. But they must be sadly perplexed at seeing the same clergyman practising for conscience sake at Littlemore what he conscientiously neglects at Oxford; and accounting important at St. Mary's on Monday, what he feels warranted in contravening on Sunday; and to find such a man as Dr. Pusey defending these anomalies because they do not "startle" a congregation, or savour of innovation or irregularity.

III. On the third head we need not spend many words. Dr. Pusey's statement is as follows:

"In no one church, or chapel, has any 'needless bowing' been introduced: clergymen, indeed, here always bow at the name of our blessed Lord, wherever it occurs; but this you would not think needless, though I understand that some have not scrupled to disuse it, even in the Creed. In the cathedral, the dean and canons have, from time immemorial, on leaving the choir, bowed to the altar."

There is somewhat of ambiguity in this negation, as it does not clearly appear what Dr. Pusey considers to be needless bowing. He does not think "bowing to the altar" needless, whereas some of his readers may consider it not only needless, but a relic of superstition, which it were better to omit than to defend. He probably would not have thought Archbishop Laud's bowings at St. Catherine Cree church needless; and yet many good men and sound Anglicans have accounted them so. The eighteenth canon of our church enjoins that "When in time of Divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying, by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true and only Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised." The compilers of the canons thought it necessary to give this truly pious and affecting statement of their reasons for retaining this "due and lowly reverence" "as it hath been accustomed;" though it probably originated in a literal interpretation of a figurative text, that "at the name of Jesus every

knee shall bow;" and though also the same reverential feeling should pervade the soul at the mention of the Father and the Holy Spirit. We would not speak of this as "needless bowing;" though we are quite ready to express our strong feeling, that any very strikingly marked flexion of the body, as in the formal routine observance of the children of charity-schools, tends (except in the creeds) rather to distraction than solemnity, where the name of our Divine Saviour occurs frequently in the services.

We are not aware whether Mr. Townsend meant that there has been any other bowing than that which occurs at the name of Jesus. If there has, we should say decidedly that it was both "needless" and superstitious. We will frankly state to Dr. Pusey what is frequently mentioned in conversation, but without urging it as a charge, since it may admit of explanation. It has been distinctly stated by various persons who have attended Divine worship at St. Mary's, Oxford (having no intention of observing peculiarities, or even being aware of any,) that they were shocked at what appeared to them repeated reverences before the elements of bread and wine at the Lord's Supper; and Dr. Pusey himself, be it remembered, vindicates the practice of bowing "to the altar," which is quite as superstitious. It appears to us, however, possible that they mistook the bowings at the name of Jesus, for bowing before the elements; but we well know that a very popish air may be given to the holy communion, by apparently slight peculiarities in the manner of consecrating and distributing the sacramental symbols. For example, the Romanist priest stands before his altar with his back to the people, and performs a variety of mysterious ceremonies, uttering words which the people cannot distinctly hear; till suddenly his mummeries (for, alas! such they are) being performed, he lifts up the consecrated host for the adoration of the people. The Church of England shuns all this mysterious parade of ceremony; and in particular it directs that the priest shall stand and officiate at the north end of the communion table, in order that the people may distinctly hear all that is said, and see all that is done: and yet some divines defeat her intentions by standing before the table during the consecration, so that the people, not seeing their hands, and scarcely hearing their voices, may easily mistake even the reverences at the name of Jesus for bowing before the elements. A studied effort to convey by gesture the notion of a priest and a sacrifice, destroys the Scriptural and Protestant simplicity of the Lord's Supper. We shall have occasion to recur to the mode of celebrating the holy eucharist; but, in the meantime, we copy the following passage from Wheatly, to shew that we are fully borne out in our construction of the rubric. Wheatly says:

"If it be asked whether the priest is to say this prayer, standing before the table, or at the north end of it; I answer, at the north end of it: for, according to the rules of grammar, the participle *standing* must refer to the verb *ordered*, and not to the verb *say*. So that whilst the priest is ordering the *bread and wine*, he is to stand before the table; but when he says the prayer, he is to stand so as *that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people*, which must be on the north side. For if he stood *before* the table, his body would hinder the people from seeing: so that he must not stand there; and consequently he must stand on the north side; there being in our present rubric no other place mentioned for performing any part of this office. In the Romish Church indeed they always stand before the altar during the time of consecration; in order to prevent the people from being eye witnesses of their operation in working their pretended miracle; and in the Greek church they shut the chancel door, or at least draw a veil or

curtain before it—I suppose upon the same account. But our church, that pretends to no such miracle, enjoins, we see, the direct contrary to this, by ordering the priest so to order the bread and wine, that he may, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread and take the cup into his hands before the people."

IV. Mr. Townsend had said, "Some have added to the surplice a peculiar kind of cross;" to which Dr. Pusey replies, "No cross has been added to the surplice." This seems as decided a denial as that "No one alteration has been made in any one church or chapel in or near Oxford." But it is a reply rather to the sound of Mr. Townsend's words than to their meaning; though that meaning might have been expressed more clearly, so as to bring out the real gravamen of the charge. In our pages no statement ever appeared of "a cross being added to the surplice." What we related, was perfectly correct to the very letter; and our statement is fully confirmed by Dr. Pusey himself. The matter may not appear worth much discussion; but Dr. Pusey's attempted palliation affords such a specimen of specious fallacy in argument, and of the arbitrary innovating spirit in which this class of divines are pressing forward their irregularities, that we feel it our duty to quote the whole of his remarks, and to offer some comment upon them. He says:

"No cross has been added to the surplice; only one clergyman, who was at the time at Oxford, but not connected with any parish church, (thinking this to be enjoined by the rubric prefixed to the morning prayer) 'wore in the time of his ministration such ornaments as were in this church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.' The scarf had then, it is said, two small black crosses, one at each end; it is a simple, unostentatious dress; but he wore it, not as 'thinking himself justified by primitive antiquity,' but in obedience to a rubric, as he thought, as that rubric is explained by Bishop Cosins and other eminent authorities. If we allow ourselves in what is the less rigid interpretation of that rubric, surely we may be content with this, without censuring those who adhere to it strictly. There is no uniformity at present; in some places the university hood is worn, in others, not; in some, persons neither graduates of divinity nor chaplains wear a scarf, in others, not; let every one (where his ecclesiastical superiors do not direct otherwise) do that which he is 'fully persuaded in his own mind;' and this in lesser things as in greater. Whether the dress were that of Edward VI., I cannot say; it is enough for the principle that it was adopted as being sanctioned by the church; and besides, one instance does not imply a system."

Every line of this statement requires a running comment; but we will not trespass so largely. We will confine ourselves to two or three points.

And first, Dr. Pusey says, "No cross has been added to the surplice." We have replied that this is an answer to the sound of Mr. Townsend's words, rather than to their sense. Mr. Townsend, we presume, never meant that a cross had been embroidered upon the surplice itself; but that over the surplice there has been worn a popish stole with "a peculiar kind of cross." Assuredly this is an addition to the surplice; though we think that the superstitious St. Andrew's cross was rather an aggravation of the offence, than its essence, which consisted in adding the unauthorised—nay, the deliberately rejected—stole to the vestments permitted or enjoined by the church.

Dr. Pusey goes on, "Only one clergyman;" and concludes, "One instance does not imply a system." Mr. Maurice had, however, affirmed that this vestment "has made its appearance, not only in one of the Oxford churches, but also in a chapel of one of our most eminent and distinguished colleges," so that if there was only one delinquent, he was, at least, very open and daring in his irregularity. Statements, however, have gone abroad, that among the Oxford young men who

have been recently ordained deacons in various parts of the kingdom, not one, but several, have adopted and are using this uncanonical vestment; and that others would gladly do so, if they were permitted by the presbyter under whom they officiate. But be this as it may, and supposing that only one individual had enacted this foppery; yet where and how has he done so? In his public ministrations in a parish church in Oxford, the normal school of ecclesiastical regularity; and also "in one of our most eminent and distinguished colleges," before the eyes of his academical superiors, equals, and juniors; thus connecting, in the one instance, his diocese and bishop, and in the other his college, and through it the university, with his irregularity; for if they saw it, or heard of it, and did not check or prevent it—which Dr. Pusey does not say they did—they were responsible for it. It was, in fact, a grand public experiment; and it formed a common subject of conversation both by town and gown. The eyes of laymen and ecclesiastics, of oppidans and academics, were fixed upon the new stole and its embroidered St. Andrew's crosses. Should such an innovation be allowed, and in such a place, and under such circumstances? It might have passed almost unobserved in a rustic village; but in an Oxford church and a college chapel it was a public ecclesiastical experiment; and it succeeded; for not only is it not said that the young man was interdicted ministering in a church or attending a college chapel in his new vestment and crucial decorations; but the Regius Professor of Hebrew comes forward in print to defend his most irregular and unseemly conduct. There was a conceitedness in a young man's so acting, which in former days would have been justly discountenanced by any officer of the University in Dr. Pusey's responsible station.

But let us listen to the defence. First, Dr. Pusey expressly asserts, quoting the rubric, that this clergyman "wore in his ministration such ornaments as were in this Church of England, by the authority of parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI." Secondly, he describes the decoration as being a scarf with two small crosses; he should have added, worn over the left shoulder, *not* scarf-wise; and he should also have noticed, that the crosses are not Latin crosses, but St. Andrew's; for all these circumstances are requisite to be considered in identifying the vestment, so as to ascertain whether it may be lawfully worn, as having been in use by authority of parliament in the second year of Edward VI. Thirdly, the learned Professor goes out of his way to laud and recommend this popish vestment as "a simple and unostentatious dress;" so that he had seen, examined, and approved it; and he encourages other young men to adopt it by his authoritative commendation; it is therefore something like affectation, after this, to talk of "only one clergyman," as if he were an insulated, crotchety individual, whose conduct no person approved; whereas he was a pioneer and fugleman. Fourthly, Dr. Pusey says that the innovating deacon thought himself warranted by the rubric; and he justifies him as adhering "strictly" to it; whereas others, he says, explain it away, or, in softened phrase, give to it "the less rigid interpretation;" so that Dr. Pusey here seems to consider the right or "strict" interpretation to be, that the St. Andrew's cross stole is enjoined; though afterwards he adds that he cannot say whether it is or not. And, fifthly, he says that "it is

enough for the principle that it was adopted as being sanctioned by the Church."

Each one of these heads contains a text for annotation; but especially the last; that because some young clergyman reads in some old book that some rite, form, vestment, or ceremony, was once in use, and supposes that he has made a discovery that the Prayer-book ought to be so construed, he is forthwith to revive it, of his own volition, and to put on all sorts of fantastic garments, or to adopt strange rites, without so much as laying the case before his diocesan for his approval of the new vestment or ceremonial. Dr. Pusey, instead of defending this young canonist, ought to have told him that in such matters as those in question there is one plain rule laid down by the Church, namely, that if he have any doubt whether he ought to officiate according to the forms of the Church of England, as he finds them universally established, he is to propose his difficulty to his bishop, and not to disturb the peace of the Church with his novelties or revivifications. Dr. Pusey's limitation, "where his ecclesiastical superiors do not direct otherwise," takes in cases in which they have been consulted, or, at least, in which the matter might be supposed to have been before them; and this applies very properly to such particulars as he alludes to of the well-known diversities of hoods and scarfs and so forth; but not to the case of ceremonials altogether novel or obsolete. Besides, it is not dutiful or respectful to "ecclesiastical superiors," to adopt new forms, leaving to them the onus of finding out the irregularity and forbidding it; when, perhaps, the irregularity has gained a vested interest, and party-spirit has arisen, and a bishop cannot interfere without much personal and public inconvenience. However, our bishops ought to learn a lesson from Dr. Pusey's statement, namely, that the Oxford Tract divines will not first consult their diocesan, but will first follow their own devices, leaving to the bishop to check them if he see fit. This being laid down as the law of the case, our bishops ought to initiate inquiries, and not to wait in a vain expectation of being consulted.

With regard to the vestment itself, which Dr. Pusey first asserts, quoting the rubric, was worn by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.; next, that it is "strictly" rubrical; and lastly, that he does not know whether it was used or not; we have only this to say, and most decidedly, that no such dress was in use in the second year of Edward VI., by authority of Parliament; so that if a vestment adorned with St. Andrew's crosses were as "simple and unostentatious" as it is superstitious and popish, it could not be lawfully used by the clergy of the Church of England. But we must not permit Dr. Pusey to plead either that the vestment is strictly rubrical, or that he cannot tell whether it is or not, when with a few minutes' inquiry he might ascertain the truth, which is that it has not a shadow of authority. Any clergyman who is not prepossessed by the notions of the Laud school, would conclude, even without inquiry, that the Church of England could not have invested her deacons with St. Andrew's crosses, when even the Latin cross is excluded from the decorations of her priests and bishops. We will not write anew upon this subject; but as Dr. Pusey has published the above-quoted mistakes, which even our "unlearned" pages would have enabled him to rectify, we will quote a few remarks from our Number for last August for the con-

sideration of any deacon who may have been inclined to defer to Dr. Pusey's authority. We said:—

"The Rubric refers to the vestures and ornaments in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.; and that Act of Parliament refers to the first Prayer-book of Edward, which is therefore (in conjunction with the Canons) the standard of ecclesiastical vestments. Was, then, the recently-introduced Oxford diaconal badge thus authorised? Most assuredly it was not; nay, it is a very remarkable circumstance, that whereas Edward's first Prayer-book mentions surplices, hoods, albs, vestments, copes, tunicles, rochettes, and the pastoral staff, as articles of ecclesiastical furniture, some of which were permitted and others enjoined, according to the order of the individual and the place and service, the particular badge now revived is passed over, and we believe of express purpose. Mr. Palmer himself, who coalesces with the Oxford-Tract divines, and laments that we do not pray for the dead, and whose work upon the antiquities of the English Ritual was published in 1832, from the Clarendon press, is obliged to confess that even the scarf (which is the priest's stole) is not authorized by the English ritual. We have no fault to find with the scarf, which has been long worn, without offence or superstition, by ecclesiastical dignitaries, by chaplains, and by many parochial clergymen; but, strictly speaking, it is no part of the English ecclesiastical dress; nor is it a canonical badge of a chaplaincy; and we believe, as already said, that it was purposely omitted, because in the early days of the Reformation the Deacon's stole, the Priest's crossed scarf, and the Eastern Bishop's and Western Archbishop's pall, were popularly viewed as symbols of superstition. Such matters are not in themselves worth contention; but if the Oxford divines succeed in raising another war in the Church about decorations, we must give up the innocent and long-accustomed scarf, rather than resume the Deacon's stole or the Episcopal pall, unless by a rubrical sanction, under the authority of the Crown, the Convocation, and Parliament."

"Having shewn that the use of the Deacon's stole is unlawful, we need not descend to the minor objection, that it is inexpedient. We should say, that in the present day to revive the obsolete cope or tunicle, though lawful, would be inexpedient; that it would distress many members of the Church, and be made an evil use of by Papists, Dissenters, and Infidels. On the same ground we should protest against the introduction of the Deacon's stole, even if it were lawful, which it is not; and even if it were like the customary scarf, a mere slip of silk or other fabric; not rendered superstitious by a St. Andrew's cross, or other fanciful insignia. If we go back to the first Prayer-book of Edward, we must reject the scarf, and revive the obsolete garments and ornaments; but we must not introduce the pall or the stole, any more than the scapulary. In the second Prayer-book of Edward, the alb, vestment, and cope were forbidden; the priest and deacon being directed to wear "a surplice only," and the Bishop a rochette. Under Elizabeth the old Rubrics were revived, and they have continued in force ever since; but custom has caused a practical uniformity, which no judicious friend of the Church would wish to disturb. For individual clergymen to presume to make such innovations as we have specified without the sanction of the Ordinary, or, in the last resource, of the Archbishop, certifying that their innovations are canonical or rubrical, is most extraordinary arrogance. If our Prelates suffer such beginnings, they will repent it when too late to amend it."

V. Mr. Townsend's next head is "Unusual attitudes in devotion;" to which Dr. Pusey replies, "I know of none." He supposes, however, that Mr. Townsend may allude to the practice of kneeling eastward at the communion rail instead of in the reading desk, while ministering in the daily service. Possibly, however, Mr. Townsend referred also to certain alleged Laud-like approachings and retirings at the holy communion, and to the gestures above alluded to in "offering up" and consecrating the elements. It has been asserted that at St. Mary's Oxford, and in some other churches and chapels, the demeanour of the officiating clergyman at the holy communion has been remarked as very peculiar; so that the service assumed an air not usual in the Anglican communion; but as persons in church ought to be employed in worshipping God, and not in noting the gestures of the priest, we have never sought for any precise information,

and are quite content to know only what Dr. Pusey himself admits; and we distinctly state, that, whatever may be the truth or falsehood of various popular rumours, we do not make ourselves responsible for them.

Dr. Pusey then admits and justifies the practice alluded to. He says:—

"Those large massive structures which are still called reading-*desks*, are the innovations; it is quite an innovation to pray towards the west." "The custom of praying with the face to the people, or (as it is called) '*reading* prayers to the people,' is the innovation; and a very mischievous innovation it has been, in that our clergy are continually tempted to think of teaching their people how to understand the prayers, and to pray emphatically, instead of thinking of Almighty God, and praying to him."

If in Dr. Pusey's circle of acquaintance the absurd phrase "reading prayers *to the people*" is usual, we are sure it is not in ours; and even the word "reading" is extremely distasteful to us; though Dr. Pusey does not offer a substitute; nor is it easy to find a satisfactory one; for it is too indefinite to say, "I prayed last Sunday at such a church," or "I officiated." The phrase in the canons is, "saying of prayers." But, in order to shew Dr. Pusey that the expression which he objects to is not pleasing to those "divines of a certain class," against whom the Oxford Tracts are specifically levelled, we will refer him to a paper in our volume for 1821, and quoted in our volume for 1835, p. 152, in which our correspondent, the late Mr. Simeon, makes a priest reply to a deacon who had asked, "Is this the plan you would recommend for reading the prayers?"—"No, I have an easier and better plan than that; never read the prayers at all; but pray them." It is an unjust insinuation, therefore, that because a clergyman does not turn his back to the people he does not "think of Almighty God and pray to him."

The practice under consideration may seem unimportant, but the Oxford Tract divines know well that it involves very serious principles. The genius of popery is to invest the Christian minister with the attributes of the Jewish priesthood. He offers a direct sacrifice for the people; he presents their prayers to God; and the intercourse between heaven and earth is carried on through him; the Church being every where interposed between the soul and its Creator. Protestantism rectified this error; a minister in its communion offers up prayers *with* his flock; not merely *for* them, with his back turned towards them as in the Church of Rome, where the priests speak in a low inaudible voice with their face to the east, as a sort of intercessors rather than fellow-worshippers. Wheatly describes their practice as follows, and it agrees remarkably with that adopted by Dr. Pusey's friends (only omitting offensive phraseology), while it is quite contrary to the whole spirit of the Anglican ritual. "It is a custom," says Wheatly, "for the (Romanist) priest at all the long prayers to kneel before the altar, and mutter them over softly by himself; but whenever he comes to any versicles where the people are to make their responses, he rises and *turns himself in order to be heard.*" Wheatly, who is always glad to find something that he can compliment Rome upon, thought the compilers of our liturgy might probably have this in their eye when they ordered the minister to stand up at the versicles before the collect for the day. It might, or might not, be so; the standing up is very befitting, whoever suggested it; but what we wish the reader to

notice is, that nothing is said of turning himself round towards the people in order to be heard, as would be necessary if the Church had intended the plan practised by the Romanists and the Oxford-Tract divines, and advocated by Dr. Pusey. The Anglican clergyman merely rises quietly in the reading desk; his face is already towards the people; but if the Church had meant the service to be read in the Romanist fashion, it would have directed that the clergyman, who is kneeling at the altar, and "muttering" with his back to the people, should rise, and turn round towards them at the versicles; as we presume Mr. Newman and his friends do. It is easy to see that saying the prayers in this manner must of necessity lead to greater changes of "attitude" than Anglican worshippers have been accustomed to, and give to the whole service much of that restless and even theatrical air which our reformers so justly blamed in the Church of Rome.

The whole system of turning to the east is popish, and we defy Dr. Pusey to produce anything in its defence from the formularies of the Church of England. We have heard clergymen argue that the canons enjoin it; but this is a mistake: the canons direct bowing at the name of Jesus; and because in the creed the custom has been retained, from old times, of turning towards the east while reciting it, many persons blend the two as if they were both canonical. Let Wheatly himself tell us what is the reason for turning towards the east in repeating the creed; for even Wheatly never vindicated a clergyman's saying the service towards the east at the rails of the altar. He says: "When we repeat the creed it is customary [customary, not enjoined or rubrical] to turn towards the east; so that, whilst we are making profession of our faith in the blessed Trinity, we may look towards that quarter of the heavens where God is supposed to have his peculiar residence of glory." And again: "It is probable, even from Scripture itself, that the majesty and glory of God is in a peculiar manner in that part of the heavens; and that the throne of Christ, and the splendour of his humanity, has there its residence." We could have wished that Wheatly had condescended to quote at least one or two of those texts which he thinks render this "probable." It is nothing but a patristical phantasy, derived not from Holy Scripture, but from pagan mythology. The worship of the rising sun was one of the oldest and most widely spread inventions of idolatry; and the Jews were not only forbidden by precept to join in it, but their temple was reversed, the entrance being eastward, and the holy of holies westward; and they were appointed to worship with their face to the west, and their back to the east; and worshipping towards the east was accounted a sign of idolatry. There is a remarkable passage on this subject in Ezekiel viii. 14—16. The prophet had been shewn one iniquity after another; but what was the climax of them all? "Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord's house which was towards the north; and, behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz. Then said he unto me, Hast thou seen this, O son of man? Turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations than these. And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house; and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five-and-twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east; and they worshipped the sun towards the east."

We ask, in all seriousness, has "the quarter of the heavens where God is supposed to have his peculiar residence of glory," changed since the days of Ezekiel? Besides, if worshippers all round the world all look towards *their* east, they take in the whole circumference of the celestial concave. Wheatly, placed in New Zealand, would point to the very opposite side of the heavens to that which in England he thought was the place where Christ's humanity has its residence. In the twenty-third of Ezekiel "the glory of God came from the way of the east;" and Christ, the Son of righteousness, rose in the east of Europe (though to the west of our Asiatic fellow-Christians); and Daniel looked westward, towards the temple, when he prayed in the land of bondage; but to predicate localities in the position of the third heavens from such terrene allusions, which change in their geographical bearings with every meridian and latitude, is more fanciful than solid.

Whether we pray eastward or westward, is in itself a matter of perfect indifference, and not worth contending about; and we may lawfully receive indifferent customs as we find them, as we do the names of the days of the week, provided all things be done decently and in order. But when we are told that clergymen are to kneel towards one point of the compass rather than another, in order to express their belief that God has "his peculiar residence of glory there," and that "the throne of Christ, and the splendour of his humanity, hath there its residence," then we may well decline to adopt even an indifferent attitude, which is to be the voucher for our belief in these unscriptural fancies.

But it may be said that we have not replied to Dr. Pusey's argument that the practice of saying the prayers at the altar rail, with the minister's face to the east, and his back to the west, is the old practice, and that the present custom is the innovation. There is a remark of Matthew Henry's, in his comment upon the passage above quoted from Ezekiel viii., which, considering that he lived more than a century and a half ago, and within little more than a century after the Reformation, is worth quoting. He says, "These priests, finding the worship of the sun had antiquity and general consent and usage on its side—the two pleas which the priests use at this day in defence of their superstitious rites, and particularly this of worshipping towards the east—practised it in the court of the temple, *thinking it an omission that it was not inserted in their ritual.*" It seems, from this sly and caustic remark, that in Matthew Henry's day, as well as in ours, there were divines who thought it "an omission" that praying towards the east was not inserted in the English ritual; for they argued, as Dr. Pusey does, that "it is quite an innovation to pray towards the west;" and that antiquity and general consent and usage were on their side. We might remark that a century and a half of prescription (even if this were all) since the days of Matthew Henry, might well be allowed to settle our modern practice, where there is nothing in the ritual to countenance any other; but we go much further; for we deny that the practice of saying the prayers kneeling towards the east retroverted from the people, was ever the settled custom of the reformed Church of England. Some of the old habits, doubtless, were kept up for a time by various clergymen who were papists at heart, or little better; just as "bowing to the altar" has never to this

hour been wholly banished; but our Reformers, from the first, were anxious to introduce that very way of praying the prayers which Dr. Pusey alludes to in the specious, but unfair, remark of "teaching their people to understand the prayers, and to pray emphatically;" which, translated into plain English, implies the opposite to what Wheatly means when he says that "the (Romanist) priest, at all the long prayers, kneels before the altar, and mutters them over softly by himself." We deny that the popish method is so devotional as a Protestant clergyman's praying them reverently, and with good understanding, with his face to his congregation; and as to edification, there can be but one opinion among men who will allow their heart and understanding to have scope, unimpeded by antiquarian prejudices.

This history of the matter in question was this. The first Prayer-book of King Edward VI. directed the priest, "being in the choir, to begin the Lord's Prayer," with which the service at that time commenced. The practice was, in fact, left as it had existed in the church of Rome. This relic of Popery gave so much concern to the foreign Reformers, that Bucer, as Wheatly tells us, "grievously declaimed" against it at the request of Calvin; urging that "it was a most unchristian practice for the priest to say prayers only in the choir as a place peculiar to the clergy, and not in the body of the church among the people, who had as much right to Divine worship as the clergy;" and that "reading Divine service in the chancel was an insufferable abuse, and ought immediately to be amended, if the whole nation would not be guilty of high treason against God." Wheatly adds, that "this terrible outcry, however senseless and trifling, so far prevailed, that when the Common Prayer-book was altered in the fifth year of King Edward, the following rubric was placed in the room of the old one; namely, 'Morning and Evening prayer shall be used in such places of the church, chapel, or chancel—and the minister shall (so) turn him—as the people may best hear. And if there be any controversy therein, the matter shall be referred to the ordinary.'" Thus the rubric remained till the days of Queen Mary; though, as many of the conformers to the Reformed Church of England were still Papists, mere vicars of Bray, and all had been educated in Popish habits, much variety of practice prevailed; some continuing the old custom, and others going into the body of the church to officiate. At Queen Elizabeth's accession the rubric was set forth which still continues in our Prayer-books—namely, that "The Morning and Evening service shall be used in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel." Wheatly contends that this brought back the first rubric of Edward, for that the other had not been long enough in use "to establish a custom:" but it had been in use till the return of Popery destroyed it; and would have continued to be so, had Elizabeth succeeded immediately to Mary: so that it is strange to say that the revisors intended to ride over the last rubric, and to re-enact an old one which had been cancelled many years before. The custom was that which the last law had made it; though, as there was some ambiguity in the wording of the rubric, the favourers of the Romanist custom doubtless availed themselves of it. But before long, reading desks were very generally introduced; so that, says Wheatly, their adoption "came to be an universal practice, insomuch that the Convocation in the beginning of King James the First's reign ordered that in every church there

should be a convenient seat made for the minister to read service in." The very word "in," implies an inclosed desk, as we now have it, and not an open altar rail. This injunction is embodied in the canons; and even Wheatly himself is obliged to admit, that as this canon passed "almost threescore years before the restoration of King Charles II.—at which time the last review of the Common Prayer was made—it is very probable [we should say it is quite certain] that when they continued this rubric, *they intended the desk, or reading pew, should be understood by the accustomed place for reading prayer*; and what makes this the more likely, *is* a rubric at the beginning of the communion, which expressly mentions a reading pew, and seems to suppose one in every church." Such is the judgment of Wheatly, who would gladly, if he could, have found a reason to the contrary.

We cannot conceive of evidence stronger than the above to prove the intention of our Church. With the exception of the first incipient and not fully-digested, though in the main admirable and scriptural, Prayer-book of King Edward, which did not enter at all into the question, but left that and many other matters just as it found them, the church has set itself against the Romanist practice, and not one syllable in all our formularies favours it. And yet with all this mass of evidence against them, these Oxford divines think themselves justified in calling that the "accustomed place," which Wheatly himself allows had not, so long back as the revision of the Liturgy in the days of Charles II., been so for eighty years; and which had, in fact, never been so in law from the days of King Edward; though, possibly, some of the clergy might for a time adhere to their old habits, till reading-desks became so general, that we know not that any clergyman, from the days of Elizabeth to those of Mr. Newman, ever said the daily prayers after the Romanist fashion. But, again we ask, if Mr. Newman and his friends wish to revive the custom, why do they not produce, as duty requires, their diocesan's permission to do so? though we confess that a bishop might well reply, that he never heard that there was any "doubt" or "diversity" in the matter.

We ought not to omit to add, that Dr. Pusey pleads under this head, as before, that there has been no innovation, for that the new custom has been introduced only to new congregations; as if a congregation were a well-defined numerical, indissoluble, unchangeable body; and as if, also, all the congregations in England were not one church. He says, that in those instances in which the practice has been adopted, "the congregation is new; and so careful has the minister been not to introduce what would *to his congregation* be an innovation, that in the Lord's-day service performed in the nave, he continues to kneel as before." If so, it is not a matter of conscience; and why then make a schism for nothing? As for Professor Pusey's doctrine of making the propriety or delinquency of an alleged ecclesiastical irregularity to rest, not upon the merits of the question, but upon the date of a church or the fluctuations of a congregation—it is, to say the least, a novelty in canon law. It has, however, the advantage of being a very comprehensive and unanswerable argument; for suppose that the Hon. Mr. Spencer, before he finally left our communion for Rome, had chosen to celebrate mass every Sunday in a new church, and every Monday in an old one, and that we had complained of the "alteration;" he might have replied, that the Christian Observer had

"misled" the public; for that there had not been any "alteration" whatever; there never having been a congregation in the new church, and the Monday congregation in the old one being newly formed. Yet thus argues Professor Pusey.

VI. Dr. Pusey's last head is in reply to Mr. Townsend's statement that the innovators have introduced a side-table for the bread and wine, before their being placed upon the communion table by the priest. To the uninitiated this may seem a point of small moment; for it cannot be of the slightest consequence whence the elements are taken; whether the clergyman brings them himself from the vestry; or whether they are handed to him by the church-warden, or deposited within his reach in a niche or on a side table; or whether, according to the custom which has long become almost universal, having been covered up on the communion table itself before service, to be ready in case there should be a sufficient number of communicants—which cannot be ascertained, especially in small country parishes, till the non-communicants have gone out of church—the priest, at the proper time, as directed by the rubric, "shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient;" the materials being at hand, or perhaps even already upon the table in gross, though covered up as if they were not, and the priest now uncovering them, and taking what portion of them he thinks sufficient, and placing it upon the table for use. There is not the slightest objection to a niche or a side-table, abstractedly considered; the bread and wine must be deposited somewhere; but the real object of the introduction of the side-table is to shew, by a visible emblem, that the priest is a sacrificer; that the communion-table is an altar; that the word "oblations" does not mean offerings to the church, as distinct from the "alms" to the poor; but implies that the bread and wine are a sacrifice; and that the expression "place upon" means not merely what it ordinarily imports, but "offer up," as Archbishop Laud expressed it in the Scotch liturgy, though the reformers of the English liturgy had expressly expunged every word that implied sacrifice; and even the last revisors, though strongly urged, would not insert it, unless, as has been sometimes unworthily alleged, they did it "by a side-wind," not daring to do it openly, when they admitted the word "oblations." In the Latin and Greek churches there is a niche, slab, or table; but our reformers, for the reasons above specified, would not allow one; the canons which enumerate minutely "things appertaining to churches;" namely Bible, prayer-book, homilies, font, "decent communion table," pulpit, "the ten commandments and chosen sentences," alms-chest, aye, and reading-desks—pointedly excluding side-tables, which the old-fashioned Anglican churchmen accounted an abomination, because they considered it a part of the manual alphabet of popery; an adjunct to altars and sacrifices. The side-table is intended to be a substitute for the ancient "prothesis," as Dr. Pusey admits; but for this very reason it was rejected as a portion of Anglican church furniture, because the prothesis was connected with superstitious notions. We open the first ritual dictionary which happens to be at hand (Mr. Trollope's Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica), at the word "altar," and there we read: "altar of *prothesis* is a name given by the modern Greeks to a small preparatory kind of altar, upon which they bless the bread for the eucharist before it is carried to the

larger one." It is not necessary to discuss whether this definition is perfectly accurate; it shews at least that the "prothesis" is not a word which Dr. Pusey should have been so ready to connect with the Anglican celebration of the holy Eucharist. But what says Wheatly himself? indeed he makes it a subject of dolorous complaint; "WE HAVE NO SIDE-TABLE AUTHORISED BY OUR CHURCH." Nothing can be more clear and true: "*We have no side-table authorised by our Church.*" But though Wheatly affirms that the Church of England has no such article of furniture—having in truth excluded it, not accidentally, but after long and zealous discussions—yet he adds that "the ancient church had generally a side-table near the altar;" and so has Mr. Newman. Now as Professor Pusey asserts that his friends have not done anything from deference to antiquity, but solely in order to comply with Anglican rubrics; he ought to favour us with a copy of the rubric which enjoins or permits the use of this litigated article of church equipment. Is there some edition of the eighty-second canon which has a misprint of "side-table" for "seat for the minister to read service in," so that, both in omitting the reading-desk, and in introducing a prothesis, the Oxford Tract divines think they are complying with the injunctions of ecclesiastical authority? Or is there a misprint in Wheatly, by the insertion of an unfortunate negative? Misprints quite as extraordinary have occurred. Our older readers will remember a controversy many years ago, in our pages, with the late Archdeacon Daubeny, one of the Oxford tract precursors, upon the doctrines now revived in those tracts. In the course of the argument, we had occasion to remark upon his quoting one of the homilies as favouring his view of faith and justification, whereas it directly opposes it. Mr. Overton had scripturally affirmed that we are justified by faith only; but that justifying faith is fruitful; and that our church (following Scripture) asserts that a faith which does not so work (the faith, for example, whatever it is, by which Dr. Pusey says an infant is justified in baptism, and which Mr. Dodsworth admits is compatible with the baptized person living and dying a profligate and an infidel) "is not properly called faith." To this Dr. Daubeny replied:

"Our reformers speak *the very opposite language.* The homily on faith sets out with informing the reader that there are two kinds of faith spoken of in Scripture, one of which is called 'dead faith,' on account of its being barren and unfruitful; but this faith, consisting in a persuasion and belief in man's heart whereby he knoweth that there is a God, and agreeth unto all the truth of God's most holy word contained in Scripture, the reformers say 'IS PROPERLY CALLED FAITH.'"—Daubeny's Vindiciæ, p. 203.

We were astounded at this assertion, which was triumphantly echoed abroad by Dr. Daubeny's friends, as proving that his opponents had "misled" the public respecting the declarations of the church of England, and that faith is not that "spiritual" fanatical principle which the Christian Observer had asserted. But upon turning to the passage in the homilies we found it written "But this is NOT properly called faith." Dr. Daubeny had omitted the negative; which we imputed to an accident in transcribing, his wish being father to that reading. Wilful misquotation was entirely out of the question; but it turned out that his copy of the homilies actually had this extraordinary misprint; and though it contradicts the whole bearing of the passage, nay, its very words in the context, the archdeacon had not discovered either the typographical or the theological blunder;

nay, he asserted that the Church of England maintains that blunder, which ought to have been, if it was not, the right reading! Mr. Newman will be fortunate if he finds an edition of Wheatly, or of any other ritualist, which omits the negative in the declaration that "side-tables are *not* authorised by our church."*

We have not offered any opinion as to the meaning of "place upon" and "oblation" as used in our communion service; since all that was necessary for us to shew was that the addition of the side-table is not a mere affair of convenience, but is meant to be significative; and accordingly Dr. Pusey defends it on the ground that the elements are a proper sacrifice which the priest offers up upon the altar. He says that when the revisors of our liturgy, at the Savoy conference in the days of Charles the Second, inserted the direction to the priest to place the bread and wine on the table, for which there was a rubric in the first prayer-book of Edward, though it was omitted, "with some other very miserable changes," in the second, and was never re-inserted till the Savoy conference, they expressly intended, by the insertion, "to restore the primitive custom of offering the bread and wine upon the altar by the hands of the priest *in commemoration of the one atoning sacrifice upon the cross;* and to express this in words, they inserted then, for the first time, the word 'oblations' after 'alms,' which was the old received name for this kind of offering." We think this statement of Dr. Pusey's will "startle" every sound ritualist and ecclesiastical scholar, whatever may be his opinion respecting the charac-

* The copy of the Homilies which by a sort of elective affinity had found its way into the Archdeacon's library, was from an edition printed in 1640, the very year of poor Archbishop Laud's downfall;—we do not mean that the Archbishop bribed or intimidated the printer to make the blunder, though, as he had despotic authority over the press, had the misprint been discovered in those days, such a charge was likely enough to have been laid at his door, among the many false charges which were heaped up, with the many true ones, against him: especially as he had prosecuted the King's printers in the High Commission Court for their negligence in omitting the very same word "not" in one of the commandments, and inflicted a ruinous fine upon them, the severity of which was afterwards remembered among the accusations against him. With the money he purchased various manuscripts with an intention of publishing them; among others, Linsell's Catena upon Job, and his Theophylact's Comment on the Epistles. Laud tells us, in his "Troubles and Trials," that the discovery of the lamentable—we should hope not wilful—misprint in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, caused a "search," when it was ascertained that "the negligence of the printers and correctors was such, as that there were found above a thousand faults in two editions of the Bible and Prayer-book." As the press was placed entirely under the control of the High Commission, Laud was highly to be commended for his conscientious vigilance in this affair; and he truly says that "the masters of the printing house well deserved to be censured;" but the "censure" was inordinately severe. Had Prynne discovered the omission of the negative in the Homily on Faith, he might have made a pretty declamation upon it; particularly if he could have foreseen that an archdeacon, of Laud's own opinions, would arise, who should gravely intimate, in spite of the almost innumerable editions of the Homilies extant before and after that time, that this unsupported reading was right; that the "not" was an interpolation; and that its omission in the edition of 1640 was probably a well-judged emendation of the editor! We almost begin in earnest to suspect that he gave Laud, or Heylin, or some other judicious divine of that school, credit for it. We have not ourselves any such suspicions; but add it to the more than thousand faults from which the printing of the Bible itself was not exempt in those days. It has been too much a habit to impute great typographical incorrectness to our modern bibles. They are incomparably more accurate than the old ones; and to those who understand the details of printing, it is astonishing, that in so large a volume there should be so few mistakes; though every one is to be lamented, and, when discovered, corrected.

ter and effects of the Holy Eucharist. Will Dr. Pusey prove to us that it was ever "the primitive custom," or the custom of any church, ancient or modern, Western or Oriental, to make an "oblation" of the unconsecrated elements, strictly "in commemoration of the one atoning sacrifice upon the cross." There has been from early times much ingenious allegorising upon the Lord's Supper, so as to make it include we know not how many species of oblation; but the chief are the four following:—1 All Papists assert what is called a "bloody sacrifice," which all Protestants reject. 2. All Protestants acknowledge an oblation of praise and thanksgiving; which Papists, and all churches ancient and modern, also acknowledge. 3. Various ancient liturgies, together with the Eastern and Western churches up to our own days, present the elements of bread and wine before consecration as an oblation to God, in acknowledgment that the fruits of the earth and all things belong to Him. "The most ancient fathers," says Wheatly, (whom we quote so much because his theological and liturgical opinions in general resemble those of the Oxford Tract school), "used some such short ejaculation as 'Lord, we offer thee thy own, out of what thou hast bountifully given us;' after which they received them as it were from him again, to convert them into the sacred body and blood of his dear Son." 4. Many divines assert that there is an actual oblation (not merely a commemoration)—but an oblation, though "unbloody," of the body of Christ, every time the elements are consecrated. This doctrine runs throughout the Oxford Tracts; and Mr. Melvill has lately urged it in the pulpit of St. Mary's, Cambridge. He says: "There is actually a sacrifice in the Eucharist;" and this not merely a sacrifice of thanksgiving, but "Christ is *offered* in the sacrament;" that is, "commemoratively;" yet this commemoration, says Mr. Melvill, is not "putting *ourselves* in mind; it is strictly a commemoration made to God the Father." "The Church," he adds, "when celebrating the Eucharist, approaches the throne of grace *by representing Christ unto his Father,* in the holy mysteries of his death and passion." We do not believe that our heavenly Father needs our "representing Christ unto him" to keep him in mind of the oblation and satisfaction made once for all upon Mount Calvary; it is we who need to be kept in mind of it, and to shew forth Christ's death till he comes again.

But we are not about, at present, to enter into any argument respecting these four species of oblation; for we have already encroached on the patience of our readers; but what we assert is, that even granting, for the sake of argument, that by placing the bread and wine upon the table our Church means offering them, and that the word "oblations" was intended to imply this (and not merely to specify the "devotions" to the church, mentioned in the offertory, as distinct from the "alms" to the poor), still most untenable is Dr. Pusey's idea that the transition from the "prothesis" to the "altar" is strictly an oblation "in commemoration of the one atoning sacrifice upon the cross." That commemoration does not take place tilllong after; for all divines, ancient and modern,—whether believing, with the Romanists, in a "bloody sacrifice," or with those Anglicans, who maintain a commemorative and "unbloody sacrifice," or with those who deny the real presence in either form, and admit only commemoration, but not sacrifice,—refer the commemoration of the body and blood of Christ to the consecration or reception of the elements. To ante-date

it, so as to include it in the word "oblations" in the Prayer for the Church Militant, is a liturgical novelty.

Much has been asserted of late respecting the real presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, in such a manner that the priest offers up to God the Father an actual commemorative sacrifice of him; and this notion, when practically embodied in gesture and attitude throughout the performance of the office, together with the literal sacrificial dedication of the bread and wine, and several other particulars which concatenate with these opinions, may be made to give to the whole celebration of the Lord's Supper an air totally alien to its scriptural simplicity and to Protestant usage. Even the revival of side-tables, therefore, is not absolutely a trifle in the general account. If Dr. Pusey had said that they are merely for decency and convenience, we would not have wasted a single penful of ink on the subject: but he has connected them, and justly, with the whole question of oblation and sacrifice. Let the rubric be strictly obeyed; let the officiating presbyter cause the bread and wine to be brought to him, if he thinks fit, from the vestry, or be deposited elsewhere till he wants it, conveniently and unostentatiously; whether upon, below, or beside, the communion-table, is of no consequence. It is only the symbolical meaning of the prothesis that is objected to; and making this serve the office of a "table," with a view to convert what the Church of England calls "the table" into an "altar." We repeat what we said in our Number for last August:—

"The whole matter, doctrinal and practical, hangs together. It is, essentially, Are we to have the Bible and Protestantism, or the Missal and Popery? We care not to stickle for one cross more or less; to decide how many images of cherubim and seraphim we may lawfully have here, or emblematical medallions of the Trinity there: but we ask, to what is the whole matter tending? What are its obvious purposes and results? It is to unspiritualize religion; to make it physical; to convert sacraments into a sort of holy charms, instead of a reasonable service; to undo the Protestant Reformation; to substitute a ritual religion for communion with God; to repudiate our sister Reformed churches, and to embrace Rome; and, above all, to obliterate that Scriptural and Protestant doctrine, by which Luther justly said we must stand or fall, Justification by Faith, and not, as Rome teaches, through baptismal influence."

ON THE DEGRADING OF THE PROTO-ENGLISH MARTYR, SAUTRE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

As much has been said, of late, of ecclesiastical and sacerdotal badges and titles, the following passage from the new edition of Mr. Southey's Book of the Church may interest your readers. It is an account of the degrading of William Sautre, parish priest of St. Osithes, in London, for Lollardism, in the reign of Henry IV. He might be called the proto-protestant martyr of England; his martyrdom having preceded that of Thorpe and Lord Cobham. He was burned at the stake for affirming that the sacramental bread continues bread after consecration; and that he would not worship the cross on which Christ suffered, but Christ who suffered on the cross.

"Archbishop Arundel stood up, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit (thus profaned in this inhuman process), degraded him, first from his priestly order, and in sign of that degradation, took from him the paten and chalice, and plucked the priestly casule from his back. The New Testament was then put into his hands, and taken from him; the stole being, at the

same time, pulled off, to degrade him from the office of deacon. By depriving him of the alb and maniple, his deprivation from the order of sub-deacon was effected. The candlestick, taper, and urceole were taken from him as acolyte; the book of exorcisms as exorcist; the lectionary as reader; he then remained in a surplice as sexton, and with the key of the church door; these also were taken from him. The priest's cap was then to be laid aside, the tonsure rased away, so that no outward mark whatever of his orders might remain; the cap of a layman was placed on his head, and Arundel then delivered him, as a secular person, to the secular court."

Here we have the popish seven orders, which make up what the Church of Rome calls "the sacrament of orders." "Dubitare nemo debet," says the council of Trent, "ordinem esse verè et propriè unum ex septem sanctæ ecclesiæ sacramentis." Episcopacy is not made a distinct order by the Church of Rome. First, we have the priest; secondly, the deacon; thirdly, the subdeacon, who attends the altar, and reads the epistle; fourthly, the acolyte, who waits on the higher officers, and manages the lights at mass; fifthly, the exorcist, who is ordained to have power over devils; sixthly, the reader, to whom the bishop formerly presented the lectionary (which contained the commandments, the epistles, and Gospels), but, in later ages, I believe the missal which embodies the lectionary, sacramentary, and antiphonary, saying, "Receive this book, and be thou a faithful rehearser of the word of God, that if thou be found faithful and useful in the discharge of thy office, thou mayst be ordained to have a part with those who, from the beginning, have behaved themselves well in the ministry of the Divine word." The seventh order is that of porter (sacristan, anglicised sexton), who keeps the keys of the church, guards the property, and maintains good order at mass. All these orders are considered indelible; the higher order not losing its power of discharging the duties of the lower; but the lower must not discharge those of the higher. A layman might not approach the altar as porter; or the porter read the word of God; or the reader exorcise; so that I was surprised to find one of your correspondents last month asserting that "the lay-reading of the Scriptures (in Divine service) prevailed before the Reformation." It never did; for the reader was solemnly ordained to his office, which was as much a part of the Romanist "sacrament of orders" as the power of celebrating mass, or remitting sins in the sacrament of penance. Nor is your correspondent justified in saying that a layman is authorised to read the lessons in the Church of England. He relies much upon the words "he that readeth" being used, and not "the minister," in the rubric before the lessons; but the words merely mean "the reader," which is a literal translation of the Latin word, as it occurs numberless times in the Breviary, meaning exclusively an ordained person; and if your correspondent had looked but three lines further on, he would have read, "Before every lesson *the minister* shall say," &c. As we have abolished the five Romanist orders, it may be doubted whether an English bishop could, if he would, appoint a reader of the lessons in the public service. It would be, in effect, a revival of a Romish order, which our church has disclaimed; and would, I think, be as little warranted as a modern deacon's assuming William Sautre's "stole."

But I would not conclude this paper with so frigid a topic; for when we read of the faith and patience of the saints in former days; of the constancy of many who, like this holy martyr, were born in dark

and ignorant ages, and surrounded by superstition, and every evil work; how does it put us to shame who have so many privileges, and make such an ill use of them! Never surely did servants know their Lord's will better: but do we do it better? or are we only earning many stripes by our unimproved mercies? It may be that our heavenly Father, seeing us such slow learners in the school of prosperity, will, in his goodness, place us in the furnace of affliction. But whether in joy or sorrow, let us pray and strive to follow our Divine Lord and Master; let us cheerfully bear his cross, and we shall then receive from him a crown;—it may not be the bright crown of martyrdom—we may be spared the trial, and lose the reward of that high destiny—but at least that crown which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give "to all who love his appearing."

Y. F. A.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

NEGRO POPULATION IN THE WEST INDIES.

The West Indies in 1837; *being the Journal of a visit to Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Lucia, Barbados, and Jamaica; undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the actual condition of the Negro Population of those Islands.* By JOSEPH STURGE and THOMAS HARVEY. London. 1838.

FOUR hundred and forty-nine thousand of our country-women, (so the number is stated in the newspapers) have just presented an energetic address to the Queen, which, at one inch per signature, would extend more than seven miles in length!—imploring that the termination of the system of West Indian apprenticeship, which is fixed by law for the first of August, 1840, should be antedated to the first of August of the present year. The same prayer has been urged in numerous petitions, and at various public meetings, metropolitan and provincial; but we cannot see our way to the conclusion thus strenuously argued. We were among the very earliest and not least zealous of those who addressed themselves to the anti-slavery contest; and when the bill of emancipation was brought forward, taking our stand upon the broad principle that West Indian slavery was an anti-christian, an inhuman, and an accursed thing—not an institution to be meliorated, but a crime to be repented of and renounced, we deprecated its continuance for one single hour. We maintained, and do still, that duty and true policy—they can never be separated—required its instant suppression; that if any preparation was necessary for freedom, it must not be with a view to secure the master's pecuniary interest or wish for domination, but must be solely such mild guardianship as may be requisite for the benefit of the slave himself, and to prevent his doing harm to others upon his first escaping from bondage, while still in a state of vice and ignorance; but that the salutary restraints of law and vigilant police, with moral and religious instruction, were all that were needed even in this respect; and that as for the proposed transitive state of apprenticeship which was to intervene

between the actual declaration of freedom in August, 1834, and its full results in 1840, it was totally unnecessary; as indeed was soon abundantly proved by the triumphant success of the just and noble experiment of the legislatures of Antigua and Bermuda, where the slave was in one moment not only emancipated, but left unfettered by the precautionary restrictions of apprenticeship; and that, not being necessary, it was a grievous infliction, and ought not to be imposed.

With regard to the grant of twenty millions of money as compensation, we never could admit that as between the master and the slave any compensation was due—except indeed to the latter; but as the nation had legislatively shared the guilt, though the country at large never approved of West Indian slavery as it really existed, but was deceived by its interested advocates, we thought justice required that if its abolition was attended with loss to the slave-master, he should be liberally dealt with; but we believed, and time has proved by the increased value of West India estates the correctness of the anticipation, that the abolition would be absolutely a boon to him; especially as the slaves would in all probability soon have emancipated themselves, and rendered his property worth nothing; so that twenty millions of money was an inordinately large sum for compensation. Yet, even this large sum, we were willing to concede, if necessary, rather than that the object should not be effected; more especially as the concession, it was hoped, would conciliate the slave-owners to co-operate cheerfully in the work of justice and mercy, and thus smooth the way to the peaceful settlement of this great question.

But did we imagine that the abolition would really work well under the provisions of the Act? Very far from it. We remarked, in our volume for 1833, p. 508, at the first introduction of the bill, that, though it was a bill for "the extinction of slavery," and so far a righteous measure, yet that there were "two most exceptionable features in it—the protracted system of modified slavery, called apprenticeship, and the relegation of the whole measure to the colonial assemblies;" adding, that though we did not grudge the twenty millions, "it is not just to be taxed, and not to secure the intended object."

In subsequent papers we endeavoured to point out various measures, moral and religious, civil and intellectual, which were requisite, in order duly to introduce the emancipated bondsman at the end of his apprenticeship to the full discharge of the duties, and the adequate enjoyment of the privileges, of his new condition. The only plausible plea for the probationary state was, that bondage might thus fuse into liberty, so as to leave no scar of a forced welding. But did we expect that the West India White population would willingly discharge the high obligations incumbent upon them? Long past experience forbad such a hope; we fully expected that they would yield only the minimum of the requisition insisted upon by the mother country; and that after pocketing the national bounty, they would do all in their power to defeat the whole measure, by forging new chains, and so contriving matters that at the end of the seven years the slave should be in reality a slave still. We well remembered the memorable declaration of Mr. Burke, in his Letter to Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville, in 1792:

"I have seen what has been done by the West Indian assemblies. It is

arrant trifling. They have done little; and what they have done, is good for nothing; for it is utterly destitute of an executory principle."

Nor had we forgotten the more recent warning of Mr. Canning:

"The masters of slaves are not to be trusted in what concerns legislation for slavery. However specious their laws may appear, they must be ineffectual in their operation; because there is something in the nature of absolute authority, in the relation between master and slave, which makes despotism, in all cases, and under all circumstances, an incompetent and unsure executor even of its own provisions in favour of the objects of its power."

Such were our forebodings; and would we could say that they have not been fulfilled. We do not mean that nothing has been accomplished; or that the efforts of this country—her schools, and Bibles, and missionaries, together with the exertions of the colonial governors and protecting magistrates whom she has sent out—have been useless; apprenticeship is not *quite* as bitter a draught as slavery; but the dregs are still in the cup, and efforts will not be wanting to stir them into the most noxious fermentation. The brief of the matter is, that the West Indies have had the money; that the work is not accomplished, or in a fair way for accomplishment; and that unless her Majesty's ministers, the imperial parliament, and the friends of the oppressed throughout the land, bestir themselves, the first of August, 1840, will be but the commencement of a new chapter of calamities.

Our conclusion may seem wide of our commencement; for it is upon premises like these that the petitioners above-mentioned have come to the inference that the West Indies having broken faith with England, the only remedy is forthwith to abolish the apprenticeship, which was a boon bestowed upon the planter, in order to secure for the slave advantages which he has not enjoyed. We cannot, however, believe that this measure would be wise. In 1833 a solemn compact was entered into, by which, in 1834, slavery was extinguished; and in 1840 apprenticeship is also to cease. To antedate that event would not be just, without proving before the legislature that the West Indies have violated their part of the covenant; and though we feel convinced that the evidence already before parliament demonstrates that they have, yet it may not be such as would warrant an *ex-post-facto* law, without the colonies being heard in their own defence. Each legislative assembly would demand to send its delegates; individuals also might be justly entitled to shew that they were not among the guilty; all which, with clever management, would protract inquiry for perhaps two sessions, so that a bill for abolishing the apprenticeship could scarcely pass before the time had arrived for its legal extinction. But, in point of fact, such a bill would never pass; while the heats generated by its discussion would minister to irritation both here and in the colonies, and probably render the condition of the apprentices more wretched than it is; as well as thwart the plans which are in progress—inadequate as they are—for their instruction and forthcoming deliverance. Amidst the chafings of the masters, and the alternate hopes and fears of the apprentices, during such a parliamentary and national litigation, the next two years would be spent in vexations which could end in no ultimate benefit to any party, and least of all to the objects of our solicitude. If, indeed, we considered that the state of temporary apprenticeship must inevitably be one of incurable injustice, we could not in conscience tolerate the delay of an hour in

abolishing it; but viewing it as designed to be a probationary and remedial transition—though we did not ourselves approve of it, and thought it worse than superfluous—we can yet admit the conclusion that it is better, during the short period that is unexpired, to endeavour to render it availing to its professed objects, than suddenly to abolish it. But it does require extensive and instant amelioration; for, as it exists at present, it is made to minister to much cruelty and injustice; and so far, therefore, from regretting that such intense feeling has been excited, even to the demanding the immediate termination of the whole system, we rejoice that the government and legislature of the country will thus have their attention fully awakened to the consideration of the question in all its bearings, in order that abuses may be promptly rectified; and that the next two years may be turned to good account, in preparing the apprentice to enter upon his new career of life with the best prospect of being a blessing to himself and to others. We need not, and must not, wait, even till next August, to correct the abuses which have been discovered, and to bestow the benefits which have been withheld. The West Indies must be fully made to understand that England, having concluded a bargain, and honourably discharged her share of the bond, will no longer tolerate the non-fulfilment of its conditions by the other contracting and largely-benefited party. Unhappily, having paid nearly the whole of the price in advance, she has lost the most powerful holding upon the refractory; but she has still power enough, in other ways, to effect her just and reasonable demand; or, if she cannot, why then we admit she has a good right, if she thinks it will benefit the oppressed party, to cut off the remaining term of the apprenticeship, and to coerce the contumacious truce-breakers into instant submission. She could easily do this; for the masters are but a small fragment of the population; and so far from being able to stand against the mother country, they could not keep under their own oppressed labourers without her aid, or exist without her protective commercial regulations. But it would be very unwise to raise such a question. Let the West Indies feel fully assured that England will not infringe one line of the Abolition Bill; that the date of August 1840 is as safe as Magna Charta, unless they themselves force its violation; but let them equally understand that the apprentices must, in the mean time, be treated justly and humanely; that there must not be the slightest infringement upon their stipulated rights; that they must be duly fed, and not unduly worked; that the present shameful abuses of what is miscalled justice, in order to promote the purposes of cupidity and tyranny, with the corporal punishment of women; the tortures inflicted in the jails, workhouses, and hospitals; and all the tricks and treachery of non-registration and unfair valuation, must be instantly suppressed; and that the legislatures must immediately adopt such measures as shall be necessary for honestly carrying out the provisions of the Abolition Act, which they have hitherto done all in their power to contravene, both negatively by refusing to pass salutary laws, and positively by passing others so unjust and oppressive, that the British crown has been obliged to disallow them. We refer particularly to Jamaica, as being the largest, most populous, and most influential of the islands; and that we may not

speak without proof, we will copy a portion of the address of the late governor (the Marquis of Sligo) to the Jamaica legislature, upon the prorogation of the lower house in February 1836.

"The very extraordinary nature of the message I have received from the House of Assembly, compels me to point out to the Legislature of Jamaica, the position in which the conduct of one of its branches has placed the colony. To that branch, therefore, must I more particularly address myself, while I review its proceedings during the present session; while I point out what disposition it has evinced to meet the wishes of the mother-country, after the unparalleled sacrifices that country has lately made in its favour; and while I recount the measures which have been recommended by me, with the fate which has attended those recommendations.

"The two messages I have recently sent down on the subject of the Police Bill and the Act in Aid, have placed my views of the manner in which those two measures have been treated in the House of Assembly in too clear a light to require more than a very few remarks.

"I pressed on you the establishment of more courts of assize, so strongly recommended by the presentment of the Grand Jury at the late Supreme Court:—you took no notice of it. A revision of the laws affecting the discipline of gaols and other places of confinement, was recommended to you. You were reminded that the infliction of corporal punishment had been deputed to the supervisors and managers of such establishments, a class to which the constitution does not confide those magisterial powers, which have been placed by you in their hands; all those subjects have remained unnoticed.

"The whipping of females, you were informed by me, officially, was in practice, and I called upon you to make enactments to put an end to conduct so repugnant to humanity, and so contrary to law: so far from passing an act to prevent the recurrence of such cruelty, you have in no way expressed your disapprobation of it. You have not even denied the truth of my assertion, and therefore must have credited it; notwithstanding, you have taken no steps to put an end to the practice.

"I communicated to you my opinion, and that of the Secretary of State, of the injustice of cutting off the hair of females in the houses of correction, previous to trial, and with no judicial sentence to authorise it; you paid no attention to this subject. [The shaving the hair is considered a mark of degradation; and it is also attended with great inconvenience under a tropical sun].

"I informed the House, that, in the opinion of the British Government, the taxation imposed by the local authorities, on the property of apprentices, was quite illegal; and that it was incompatible with the spirit of the British Constitution, that any body which is unrepresented should be subject to taxation:—you totally disregarded this suggestion. I sent you down no less than four messages on the subject of an extended system of negro education; I recommended to you the establishment of a plan, even without a vote in support of it, in order that the British Government might have some grounds to go upon; as no measure on the subject has emanated from the House, can I do otherwise than conclude that you are indifferent to it? I informed you that £25,000 sterling had been voted by England for the support of any just or expedient system of education in the colonies, with the prospect of still farther assistance being afforded,—but you have taken no steps to make it available.

"I transmitted to you a dispatch from the Secretary of State, recommending the repeal of the 23rd Canon, with a view to increase the means of religious instruction in the colony: such has been your disregard to this most desirable object, that you have not attended to the recommendation."

The governor mentions various other particulars; but the above are sufficient to exhibit the indisposition of the House of Assembly to make provision for giving effect to the Abolition Act. The house does not misrepresent the sentiments of a large majority of its constituents. Various witnesses before the House of Commons speak very strongly upon this subject. One, for instance, Mr. Beaumont, an old Jamaica resident, affirms that the Assembly had never planned a single measure in which they meant to deal honestly with the apprentices; and that "their unceasing effort was to frame their laws with such adroitness, that they might re-enact as much as possible of the ancient system of slavery,

under a new name;" and as for the planters, he adds, "They all conspired against the working of the Abolition Act, until they found that they could make it, by ingenious devices, very nearly approach to slavery; and then they withdrew their opposition."

If any thing could render the injustice of these proceedings more flagrant, it would be the admirable conduct of the enfranchised population; who on the day of their emancipation, though bitterly disappointed that it was clogged with a seven years' servitude, yet conducted themselves in the most peaceable and exemplary manner; thus frustrating the ignorant or interested forebodings which had predicted that they would rush into idleness, profligacy, and rebellion. But instead of this, they assembled in the house of God to render thanks for His mercy; and they returned in the most orderly manner, after their brief jubilee, to their labours; they have worked patiently and diligently; and the official returns shew that they now make nearly twice as much sugar in a given time, as they did under the lash; and that all their work is better performed. They are most anxious also for education, and moral and religious instruction; the schools and chapels are crowded; they are much more provident in their habits than formerly; marriage is becoming general among them; and if their employers, and the local legislatures and magistracy, would but have watched over their progress with a paternal eye, instead of treating them as beasts of burden, their advancement would have been still more remarkable. But the pride of caste and colour still continues to place great impediments in the way of their civilization and religious instruction; and this unchristian jealousy is allowed to taint all the charities of life. Long before the passing of the anti-slavery bill, the Duke of Wellington's administration, when Sir George Murray was Colonial Secretary, sent out a proclamation to all those colonies for which the crown legislates, enjoining that there should henceforth be, in the eye of the law, but two classes of persons —slaves and free-men; that all distinctions founded upon colour should cease; and that every person not a slave, should be eligible for whatever offices his conduct and talents qualified him. In 1831 the Jamaica legislature passed an act for the same purpose, and the other islands followed Jamaica; and thus a free coloured man ranked in law with a White. But let not the unwary reader think that this act of duty originated in any principle of justice or mercy; it was base selfishness; the free coloured population far outnumbered the White, and included not a few persons of property and education; indeed some of the richest merchants and most highly endowed men in the colonies are coloured gentlemen; and the whole of this body, which is loyally attached to the British crown, sided with England in wishing for the emancipation of the slaves; and determined to procure the redress both of its own wrongs and theirs. To prevent, therefore, a revolution, the legislatures found it necessary to pass the above mentioned excellent measure; but it was only a parchment law; the tyranny of caste still survived; and the governor himself was "sent to Coventry," for having allowed coloured gentlemen to darken his drawing-room. We may mention, as an illustration of this jealousy, that notwithstanding sound policy as well as religion dictates the importance of extending the means of intellectual culture to coloured young gentlemen of legitimate birth and good expectation; and

though, in particular, it is highly desirable to train up clergymen for their black and brown brethren from among this respectable class of natives—the number of White clergymen being far too scanty to supply their necessities—no pupil who has the trace of dark blood in his veins has ever yet been permitted to enter Codrington college. We respectfully ask the members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, who probably do not know the fact, whether this ought to be allowed in a literary and religious institution under their patronage? There is no such restriction at Oxford or Cambridge, and why should there be in Codrington college?

But we have too long forgotten to open the volume before us, which contains a mass of facts connected with the workings of the apprenticeship system, which Mr. Sturge and his friends earnestly maintain ought to be forthwith abolished. On this we have already stated our opinion; but we trust that Mr. Sturge will concede to us what we readily concede to him, that a question of time is fairly open to discussion, provided there be no question of principle involved in the acceleration or delay. He will reply that there is such a question; for that the injustice and oppression of the apprenticeship system, render it a solemn duty to abolish *it* instantly; whereas we think that this involves the previous principle whether these abuses are such that we may, without breach of faith, cancel the charter of 1833; and supposing this decided in the affirmative, in which we go very far with him, the question still recurs, Is it our duty to take that measure? in the answer to which we differ from him. What we desire is, that a principle, decidedly destructive to slavery, under any form, should be always in perceptible progress; and, of course, that the contrary principle should as invariably be seen on its retreat towards its final extinction. It is superfluous to remind those who believe the inherent depravity of mankind by reason of the Fall, that the common corruption of our nature develops itself with the greater malignity, as circumstances furnish temptation; and that irresponsible power, or undefined and anomalous authority, has always a downward tendency. Its declivities, where slavery prevails, are peculiarly smooth and slippery, and allure many to glide down them, who at first discovered symptoms of apprehension.

But while we hesitate to adopt Mr. Sturge's conclusion, we admit with sorrow the fearful force of his facts, and we honour his Christian zeal and humanity. His name is well known to us in connexion with his indefatigable efforts as a director of the Birmingham Railway company, to prevent Sunday travelling upon their line. His arguments have not been successful with the majority of his co-proprietors; but he has discharged his own conscience, and his exertions, from their influence in Birmingham and elsewhere, have not been "in vain in the Lord." He is about to make another attempt, in which, should he fail, he has pledged himself to withdraw from the direction; so that the company will find, that not only is what this worthy Quaker has told them true as regards their servants, that they will deprive themselves of the most valuable class of agents by this ungodly practice, and place themselves in the hands of those, who, not fearing God, are not likely to regard man, or to be found the most sober, diligent, and trust-worthy in their general conduct; but that also in the proprietorship and direction they will

be forsaken by religious and conscientious men. Mr. Sturge has clearly proved—though this, he says, is a very subordinate consideration — that the pecuniary interests of the company would not be injured by a total abstinence from Sunday travelling. As to that hypocritical device, a merely partial restriction during certain hours, he shews, that besides breaking down the principle, it cannot be carried into operation; and that the experiment on the railway from London to Boxmoor has been followed by all the evils which were predicted.

The object of Mr. Sturge's West Indian expedition (we use his name as the leader) was to ascertain, by personal observation and inquiry, the actual condition of the Negro population under the apprenticeship system; for there was much conflicting statement upon the subject, not only in the accounts received from the West Indies, but in the evidence adduced before parliament. Never since the days of Howard has there been planned a more merciful or disinterested mission. Mr. Sturge describes its equipment with great modesty, merely saying:

"It is necessary to apprise the reader, that in the course of last year, one of the individuals whose names appear on the title page, became anxious to ascertain, by personal inquiry, the results of the Imperial Abolition Act in the British West India Colonies.... Having consulted several friends, on whose judgment he could depend, and having completed the arrangements for the proposed mission, he embarked for the West Indies accompanied by J. Scoble and T. Harvey.—W. Lloyd, M.D., was also of the party; not as directly connected with their object, though affording his co-operation in carrying it into effect. The undertaking, throughout, was entirely independent of any Anti-Slavery Society. The party were not, in any sense of the word, agents, but private persons, yet engaged in what was properly a public object. The expenses of the individual with whom the design originated, were defrayed by himself; and those of two others, his professed associates, were liberally borne by a few friends, who felt a deep interest in the result of the inquiry."

We have heard much of the active exertions of well-paid West India agents in England, in opposing the claims of humanity and justice; but we never heard of a pro-slavery advocate having been found guilty of leaving his private concerns during the greater part of a year (for Mr. Sturge is actively engaged in the affairs of business) in order to take a voyage across the Atlantic, and from island to island, in a burning climate; visiting plantations, attending courts, and exploring scenes of wretchedness in prisons, hospitals, and slave-yards, merely with a view to disinterested objects of Christian philanthropy; and this at a very serious pecuniary expense, besides involving great sacrifices in other ways. Mr. Sturge and Mr. Harvey accomplished a journey of 12,000 miles by sea and land; and we sincerely believe that they have endeavoured to give a faithful delineation of what they heard and saw. Their book—which is a cheap, closely-printed volume, of nearly five hundred pages, embodying a considerable mass of document confirmatory of the text—bears internal marks of fidelity; and their statements respecting the workings of the apprenticeship system are corroborated from other quarters. We may just mention, as an illustration of this, the Narrative of James Williams, a Jamaica apprentice, whose term of servitude Mr. Sturge purchased, and whom he brought to England. The oppression exercised towards this apprentice was so flagitious, that the pro-slavery party endeavoured to discredit the account. But what has been the result? A copy being transmitted to the Colonial office, it was deemed of such

importance as to require a solemn investigation. It was accordingly sent out to the governor of Jamaica, Sir L. Smith, who appointed a commission of inquiry, consisting of a special magistrate and a local justice. At the close of their investigation, they delivered to the governor a Report, dated October 21, 1837, in which they say:

"Having taken the fullest evidence they could obtain upon the several subjects which the investigation was designed to embrace, they have now the honour to transmit, for your Excellency's information, an authentic copy of their entire proceedings. In reporting upon the general results of this extended inquiry, it has become the duty of the commissioners to state, that the allegations of James Williams's Narrative have received few and inconsiderable contradictions, whilst every material fact has been supported and corroborated by an almost unbroken chain of convincing testimony. Such being the conclusion of the commissioners with respect to the Narrative, it can scarcely be necessary to add, that the Abolition Law has not been properly administered in some parts of the parish of St. Ann's; that the house of correction of that parish was, until recently, a place of licentiousness and cruelty; and that the tread-mill has been, from the time of its erection, and still is, an instrument rather of torture than of just and salutary punishment."

This corroborative document does not appear in the volume before us, not having reached England when it was printed; but we have thought it right to insert it, both in justice to Mr. Sturge, and for the information of our readers; most of whom, we presume, have perused the widely-circulated Narrative of Williams; and some of whom may have heard the ever prompt West Indian contradiction, which might be kept ready in stereotype for all occasions, when it is necessary to rebut any awkward story which finds its way to England. We will copy from Mr. Sturge's book the original memorandum in the journal of himself and his companion, respecting the youth Williams, that our readers may compare it with the fuller accounts dictated by Williams to a third party in England.

"We called on the resident baptist missionary, John Clark, at whose house we saw two apprentices from Penshurst, the property of G. W. Senior. One of them was James Williams, a negro youth, about eighteen years of age, whose unpremeditated statements to us correspond with the more detailed account which has since been made public in England."

"His statement to us on the occasion alluded to in our Journal, is as follows: 'My master has an old grudge against me. I have been flogged seven times since the new law came in. He complained to Dr. Palmer against me for insolency, but Dr. P. gave me the right. He complained frequently to Captain Connor, who also gave me the right, and never punished me. Massa said, 'Thank God, Dr. Thompson is come, and we have got a magistrate who will see justice done.' He bear false witness against me and said, that I advise John Lawrence not to be a constable, because he was so young. I never said any thing of the kind to J. L. Dr. Thompson order me thirty-nine lashes. Finding him, and afterwards Mr. Rawlinson, so severe upon me, I went away to the King's House. I was away seven weeks, but I did not see Lord Sligo, because he was up at Highgate. When I returned, I was put in the cage at the Police station for a day and a night. I was then, by order of Mr. Rawlinson, confined for ten days in the dungeon on the property: afterwards sent to St. Ann's workhouse, where I received fifteen lashes, and danced the treadmill every morning and evening for nine days. I worked in chains on the road. I bruised my shin (on the treadmill) the first day, but on the second day I caught the step. Many people were sadly cut. You could not see any thing on the mill but blood. The prisoners on the mill, men and women, were catted most miserably. When I came out of the workhouse, I was put in the cell for four days and nights, and ordered to pay fifty days to the property. This was a year ago last September. I was afterwards ordered fifteen lashes again, for not turning the horses into their right pasture. I had so many different kinds of work to do that I neglected it. My master met me and held his stick over my head, and threatened to strike me three times. I said, it was not an

earthly man that made the world, but that The Man that made the world would come again. For this I was charged with insolence, and sent to the house of correction to dance the treadmill for seven days, and receive twenty lashes. When I came out, my massa sent me to climb bread-nut tree, and cut bread-nut. I told him I am not able, my stomach ill, you flog me so severely since the law came in. He said, if I did not make an end of him, he would make an end of me. I set off to Sir Lionel Smith, (the governor), but was taken up by an overseer on my way and sent to Rodney Hall on Saturday, and kept there till Thursday; a constable fetched me, and I reached home on Friday late. I came before the magistrate, who ordered me to receive twenty-five lashes, and to be sent to St. Ann's workhouse for a fortnight to dance the treadmill. My master says, he will bet £1000 he will make an end of me. He threatens me every day for my life, and I don't know how soon he may kill me. What make me so much afraid is, that he did kill a man; he got him ordered a severe flogging, and because the constable did not flog him enough, he ordered the policeman to take the whip. The man coughed blood. He went afterwards to Brown's Town to complain to Captain Dillon, and died in the town.'"

Mr. Sturge and his companion add the following remarks on this narrative:

"James' Williams also represented himself as being destitute of food in consequence of the cattle having trespassed in his ground while at the treadmill; and from his having to pay so many days to the estate. We saw several of the most intelligent and respectable negroes from the same estate, who confirmed his statements, assured us that his veracity might be relied on, and that he was, as he represented, in a state of starvation. The money was subsequently advanced to him to purchase his term of apprenticeship, when he was valued for upwards of £46, though he had only seventeen months to serve till he became free. The 'Narrative of Events' contains a much more detailed account, though the reader, who will compare the above statement made to us in Jamaica, with the 'Narrative' dictated to a third party in England, will find them perfectly consistent. The 'Narrative' has been published at length in the Jamaica papers, and has excited abusive and angry comments, but not one of its facts has yet been disproved. His master, G. W. Senior, has published a letter on the subject, which contains the strongest confirmation of the truth of the 'Narrative.' He admits many of the details, and does not deny the truth of a single one of James Williams's statements; contenting himself merely with vilifying his character. The sum at which he was valued is a sufficient answer to these calumnies. It was the price not only of a capable and industrious, but of an honest and orderly apprentice."

"Documents relating to James Williams have already been laid before the public, viz. the certificate of his pastor as to his veracity and general good conduct; a certificate to the same effect, signed by thirty-three free men and apprentices who are acquainted with him, some of them residing at Penshurst; and lastly, the declaration of three intelligent and respectable apprentices on Penshurst, that they have heard the Narrative read, and that it is an unexaggerated statement of facts. In addition to which, we refer to the statements of negroes from Penshurst in a preceding section of the Appendix, some of which are the relations of circumstances mentioned by Williams."

"We have thus adduced what appears to us incontrovertible evidence of the truth of the Narrative; and it only remains to ask, whether the flagrant perversion of the law by special magistrates, who are the table companions of the planters, and the present horrible workhouse discipline of Jamaica, are to be permitted to continue. Can any one read James Williams's Narrative, and persuade himself that the negroes could have been liable to greater oppression, or endured a greater amount of misery, when they were slaves in name as well as in fact."

We must refer those of our readers who wish to consider, in detail, the actual condition of the negro population, as it presented itself to the eyes and ears of these tourists, to the volume itself, as there would be no particular advantage in transcribing a few individual illustrations of injustice and oppression. These might even be exceptions; but it is the aggregate that makes up the system. The general aspect of the landscape is dark; though there are bright features; and Mr. Sturge and his friends are not niggardly in their eulogies upon those masters who treat their

bondsmen as hired servants—as brethren; and who combine their efforts to evangelize the heathen exiles of Africa and their descendants, with the successful labours of the missionaries, thus affectionately characterised in the very last paragraph of the volume:

"We are unable, within our allotted limits, even to attempt to render justice to missionary efforts in Jamaica. Representation cannot picture the happy results of those efforts: description can convey no idea of their excellence and magnitude. A few years ago, the negroes were heathen and benighted, now they are to a great extent enlightened and christian. The Sabbath, once desecrated, is now devoted to public prayer and thanksgiving, and to the enjoyment of christian communion. A few years ago, education was unknown; now it is making progress under many disadvantages, and waits but for freedom, to become soon more generally diffused than in our own country. The success of missionary labours among the servile population, has been general and striking; much has been done, yet more remains to be done. The work requires to be deepened, strengthened, and extended; and we earnestly commend those benefactors of the human race, the missionaries, to the more earnest prayers, to the deeper sympathies, and to the yet more liberal support of British Christians."

It is due to the framers of this eulogy to remind the reader that it proceeds from members of the Society of Friends; and, therefore, that it is valuable, not only as a just tribute to the missionaries themselves, but as proceeding from a community not favourable to the system of missions; notwithstanding its zealous efforts to circulate the Holy Scriptures, and to promote various objects of piety and benevolence. There are many friendly allusions in the Journal to the schools, ministers, and missionaries of the Established Church; accompanied occasionally with a candid and straight-forward remark where the writers considered that anything faulty required to be mentioned. We will copy a few passages from the Tour in Barbados, which we have read with great pleasure, as indicating some of the results of the zealous and active labours of the bishop. Considering what his lordship had to struggle with, the improvement which has taken place in his diocese during the few years which have elapsed since its formation, has been equally remarkable and gratifying. In Jamaica also the benefit of the establishment of the episcopate is strikingly apparent, though the Church of England is far from having yet risen to the level of its duties, either in that or any other of the islands, especially as regards the black and brown population; which is too much relegated to the care of Moravian, Methodist, Baptist, and Independent missionaries, whose labours have been attended with an abundant blessing. The following are among the passages to which we alluded:

"After leaving Government House, we called upon the Bishop, who gave us some valuable information on the state of education. There are about eight thousand children in the diocese, receiving instruction in schools under the care of the clergy. The number has declined within the last year, in consequence of an attempt made to introduce the pay system, which has failed except in Demerara. No opposition is now encountered on the part of the proprietors, but many of them manifest much apathy, and render no assistance. The teachers are black and coloured persons. The greatest difficulty experienced in this island, is not the want of qualification on the part of coloured teachers, but their preference for more lucrative employments. Besides the children actually attending school, many others receive instruction from other children, and improve themselves by attending the Sunday schools." p. 135.

"Archdeacon Eliot and the rector of St. Mary's kindly accompanied us to visit some of the principal schools in Bridgetown, under the care of the establishment. We went first to the infant school, which is attended by one hundred and fifty children; and from thence to the boys' school, where, though it was the first day after the Christmas vaca-

tion, the attendance was about one hundred and fifty, out of one hundred and eighty on the list. We heard several classes read and answer questions, in which they displayed considerable proficiency, as well as in spelling and arithmetic. About fifty of the children were apprentices. We had not the opportunity of ascertaining on what terms they obtained leave to attend school, except that in one instance the owner received a consideration from the boy's parent, for allowing him to come. The master is a negro; he was educated in the school himself, and is a well-qualified teacher. In the girls' school, which we next visited, the attendance was about seventy out of eighty-five. They were nearly in the same state of discipline and proficiency as the boys. In the first class were several apprentices whose mistresses voluntarily sent them for improvement. Barbados is far behind Antigua in the general spread of education, but is in advance of it in the character of its schools. Besides those which we visited to-day, which are in a satisfactory state of efficiency, there are many good private schools for all classes." pp. 145, 146.

"We went this morning to the adult Sunday school connected with St. Mary's church. Besides a large number of old people, who were under examination as candidates for baptism, there were present about sixty scholars learning to read, in three or four classes. They were from fourteen to upwards of sixty years of age; several very old people were even in the alphabet class, and came, we were told, a distance of eight or ten miles to the school; an affecting proof of the general desire among the negroes for education. From the school we proceeded to church. Though the rector is free from prejudice himself, distinctions of color are still kept up in his congregation. Formerly black and colored persons were confined to the gallery; now they are allowed to occupy the pews in the lower half of the body of the church. The space appropriated to them was much crowded." pp. 143, 144.

"We called at the nearest parish school. The parishes are thirteen in number, and in most of them the bishop has established a school. Being vacation week, we could not see the children, but we had some conversation with the master and two coloured men, who were also schoolmasters. They complained also that no uniform plan of instruction had been adopted; and that the clergy seldom visited their schools, or otherwise manifested any interest in them." pp. 130, 131.

To our younger readers these facts may not seem very remarkable; but to those who remember what the West Indies were a very few years ago, when it was a crime to teach a slave to read, they will appear all but miraculous. We know not what extent of truth there is in the last quoted statement that the clergy do not manifest any interest in the schools. We are willing to allow that a few white men, with populous parishes under their care in such a climate as that of Barbados, must find great difficulty in duly visiting these numerous establishments; but we should not speak honestly if we did not say that too many of the old race of West Indian clergy have never been very prompt in following up the bishop's new-fashioned plans, and that the prejudices of some of them against the education of the servile population continue unsubdued. "The bishop's clergy," as we believe the younger men are called, are much more zealous and larger minded. We well remember that the bishop himself, in his early reports to the colonial office, did not venture to propose such an insurrectionary innovation as teaching a slave to read; the utmost he could dare to suggest, was the institution of schools to teach orally the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and even this went so far beyond the spirit of Barbadian tolerance, that it was wonderful his Lordship was not shipped home in the first packet for England. But let us not be too severe upon men educated amidst the demoralizing and heart-contracting influences of slavery, when we remember, that too many in the mother-land vindicated their proceedings. It is not ten years since that we were in high war with Quarterly Reviewers, British Critics, Christian Remembrancers, John Bulls, and Blackwoods, and even with the Society for the

Propagation of the Gospel, complained that the slaves belonging to Codrington college, the trust property of that venerable society, instead of being civilized and christianized, had been allowed to grow up, and live and die, from generation to generation, debased and ignorant, working not for wages, but under the cart-whip, living in a state of profligacy not to be described; a state worse than that of the most savage tribes, not even being acquainted with that first step to civilization, the rite of marriage; and in this wretchlessness of vice and degradation, actually coming to the holy communion; for such were the facts, and these facts were proved; and yet to speak of them, and to demand the extinction of the ungodly and inhuman system from which these evils sprang, was infidel and revolutionary; and we were told that to teach black men to read the Bible was to instigate them to cut White men's throats; and that a clergyman who dared to propose the institution of National schools in the West Indies, except for the privileged portions of the population, must be either a wilful incendiary or a madman. When such language as this was penned in England but as yesterday, we cannot wonder if similar prejudices are not yet extinct in the Antilles: and so far, therefore, from being surprised that not all, or half, is yet achieved which we desire to behold, we thank God and take courage. If, in the year 1828, when the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge published in its Report the fact which we had been so often called false accusers for declaring, that notwithstanding all the parade of "catechetical schools," and "instruction," and "education," in the Reports of the Society for the Conversion of Negro-slaves, and other institutions, by which the people of England were so long deceived, these schools were "conducted only upon a plan of *oral instruction, the pupils not being permitted to learn to read;*" and that this much lauded plan was now discovered to be "*totally useless;*" except, indeed, "as an introduction to a more complete system of instruction;" and that any schools but these "totally useless" ones, the West Indians would not tolerate:—if, we say, it had been predicted in 1828 that in ten years from that time a Quaker, returning from the West Indies, would declare that the Bishop of Barbados informed him there are about eight thousand children in his diocese receiving instruction in schools under the care of the clergy, we should perhaps have thought him as insane as our worthy castigators thought us. We can only say, with gratitude and admiration, "What hath God wrought."

But though God has done much; and, under his providence, English benevolence, piety, liberality, and legislation have done much; and the labours of her missionaries have done much; and the influence of bishops, clergymen, and magistrates sent out from her shores, has done much; yet we must recur to our old complaint, that their efforts have been thwarted instead of aided, by Creole society. The name of Bishop Coleridge reminds us of the book published by his nephew; who, like Mr. Sturge, had made a few months' "Tour in the West Indies," and like him printed his observations. The book was flippant, and was, of course, very hostile to the anti-slavery fanatics; but it contained some good passages, one of which occurs to our recollection while we are writing; and it bears, by anticipation, so forcibly upon the question of the oppressions exercised towards the apprentices, connived at instead of being re-

pressed by the local magistracy, or by public opinion, that we will take the liberty to quote it. Mr. Coleridge said, in 1826,

"In all countries where slavery is established, there ought to be good laws to protect the slaves, and independent judges to enforce their provisions; if there be neither one nor the other, in either case one great corrective of the excesses of the free, one great guarantee of the safety of the bond, one great fountain of civilization throughout the whole state, will be lost. As long as the slave confides in the protection of a power superior to his master, he will probably labour in tranquillity: but if he finds that there is no such power, or that such power is prejudiced against him, it is nothing but an ordinary impulse of human nature, that, in case of oppression, he should strive to obtain that by his violence which has been, or which he suspects will be, denied to his petition. In Barbados, the laws are administered by some twenty-seven or twenty-eight judges. They are all planters and merchants, and are appointed by the Governor: not one of them has ever been educated for the bar; nor is any previous knowledge of the law a necessary or a usual qualification for the office They neither comprehend the extent, nor are agreed upon the validity of the laws which they are called upon to interpret: they adhere to no fixed principles; they are bound by no precedents. It is next to impossible, in so small a community, that any cause should come into court in which some of these judges will not be directly or indirectly interested. Their ignorance, or shallow acquaintance with the duties of their office, may cause them, in moments of wrong-headedness or passion, to violate every form of law, and trample upon every principle of justice. The principle of honour, which Montesquieu, with some reason, asserts to be at least a great spring of action in all constitutional monarchies, does not exist in the colonies. I use the term honour in the sense of Montesquieu, and mean nothing with regard to the conduct of individuals. The forms indeed of the English Parliament are too gigantic for the capacities of little islands; the colonists are not elevated by the size, but lost in the folds, of the mighty robe which was never destined for their use."

Mr. Sturge's facts, in 1837, by merely changing the word apprentices into slaves, become an illustrative comment upon Mr. Coleridge's *à priori* philosophy in 1826. Mr. Sturge and his colleague never philosophize or sentimentalize; they merely relate occurrences, and point out what they consider the conclusions which they suggest. Even where they shew, as they occasionally do, that they are susceptible of the sublime and beautiful, in wandering through regions where nature "wantons as in her prime," they seem to be jealous of any fascination which may tempt them to forget their great object; so that their journal is as business-like as their office day-book; and we may gather from it, in abundance, those painful details which, when duly posted up, leave against the planters a large balance due to the apprentices, to England, to the act of abolition, and to our common humanity. Mr. Sturge is for winding up the account at once and declaring the parties bankrupt; we are rather for placing vigilant guardians over the trust for the two remaining years of the term, to see that the conditions are duly fulfilled; and, at its expiration, allowing the parties to start afresh fairly and peaceably under the new system. Or, to change the allusion, instead of at once cancelling the indentures of the West India apprentices, upon the ground that the master has not done his duty by them—though we have a good right to do this—we think it most for the welfare of all parties not to disturb them now, but to see that they are properly fulfilled, till the time legally arrives for the young freeman "to set up for himself." We chiefly regret, that the premium having been paid in advance, we have no check upon the master's conduct but that of legal coercion; but England has the power to enforce this, and we think also that she would be justified in mulcting the colonies to the full amount of whatever expense she is obliged to incur in so doing. They have had

far more than their *quid pro quo*; they have had much for little; for instead of being losers by the abolition, property has largely increased in value; land has acquired a high value; dilapidated estates have become flourishing; new soils are broken up, and discarded soils reclaimed; all which proves that no alarm is entertained as to there not being found labourers willing to work for wages in the tillage of them; an apprehension which we always took the liberty to say no man who knew anything about the matter really entertained, though it was found a very convenient pretext for staving off abolition, and augmenting compensation. In short, so beneficial has been the much-dreaded experiment of emancipation, that nothing but the most obstinate wickedness in oppressing the new freemen, can, humanly speaking, prevent that effluence of blessings which a merciful Providence seems willing to pour down upon those long degraded and desolated islands.

We trust we have said enough to shew that it is not without cause that we have recurred to a subject which we had hoped—or, rather, wished—we had done with for ever. But the tenacity of life, of everything connected with slavery, is extraordinary;

> Non hydra, secto corpore, firmior
> Vinci dolentem, crevit in Herculem.

Nearly twenty years were required to convince a majority in the British legislature, that to seize unoffending men in Africa, and to carry them over to the West Indies to sell them as slaves, was a crime which ought to be prohibited; and when, at last, Mr. Wilberforce's ever memorable Bill passed, there were found in the minority such names as those of Lord Sidmouth, Lord Bathurst, the Duke of Clarence, and the late venerable Earl of Eldon; and even George the Third himself believed, to the last, that the loss of the slave-trade would be the sacrifice of a bright jewel in his diadem. More than thirty years have elapsed since the abolition of this piratical trade by England; and still, though nation after nation has been induced to follow her example, and enormous sums have been spent in negociations, bribes, naval armaments, and civil courts, the traffic is still raging to an enormous extent, and with aggravated horrors. The protracted discussion of the slave-trade question had largely developed the appalling cruelties of West Indian slavery, and every argument against the wickedness and injustice of the one, was equally cogent as applied to the other; and yet it was not till 1823—seventeen years after the abolition of the slave-trade—that the British parliament entertained any motion which even distantly pointed towards its extinction; and ten further years of arduous conflict at home and protracted wretchedness to the bondmen, rolled away, before, in 1833, the abolition was agreed upon, and this only on condition of the sacrifice of twenty millions of money, and seven years of forced servitude; and now, within two years of the close of that period, the planters still cling so tenaciously to their "little brief authority," that, if England does not interpose, so far from slavery dying down in the socket in 1840, it will flare up again in some other devastating form, when the good people of England have gone to sleep, thinking it extinguished.

Our space has not allowed of our quoting from Mr. Sturge's details; and if it had, we should have preferred resorting to official documents, of which there is a mournful abundance. We might mention, for instance, the concurring testimonies of the three succes-

sive governors of Jamaica; and they are the more important, as from the political connection of the individuals, they could have no wish to throw discredit upon the apprenticeship system, which was the favourite scheme of their own friends. Yet scarcely had the measure passed, when we find Lord Mulgrave, who had just returned from the government of Jamaica, telling the Anti-slavery Society:—

"I cannot help advising you to keep your eye still upon the parties whose co-operation is required. As long as the system lasts there must be cruelty, founded on caprice. I much regretted that the power of arbitrary punishment was not at once taken away; for up to the last moment some instances occurred of its unwarrantable infliction."

This was the beginning; the continuance we have seen in the official address of the succeeding governor, Lord Sligo; and we are able to bring down these vice-regal attestations to the date of October 31, 1837, in the message of the present governor, Sir L. Smith, to the House of Assembly; delivered, under the most stringent circumstances of reserve and caution, to an unwilling audience, and with every temptation to put the case in the fairest light, and to make the reproof as complimentary as possible. Yet his Excellency says:

"Prudent, humane, planters have already adopted what is recommended, and their properties present the good working of this system in peace and industry, without their resorting to the authority of the special magistrates; but there are other properties, where neither the law of apprenticeship or the usages of slavery have been found sufficient to guard the rights of the apprentices."

He mentions seven heads of grievance, and suggests remedies. We will quote one of these suggestions, the very necessity of urging which shews how little the planters are willing to do for their dependants, either on the score of humanity, or in return for the twenty millions which were to compensate them for any possible loss which they might sustain by the new arrangements. His Excellency says:

"4th. The mothers of six children and upwards, pregnant women, and the aged of both sexes, would be greatly benefited by a law enforcing the kind treatment which they received in slavery: but which is now considered optional, or is altogether avoided on many properties."

His Excellency adds, that,

"The island is subject to the reproach that the negroes, in some respects, are now in a worse condition than they were in slavery."

After such a statement as this from her Majesty's representative to his colonial parliament, we need not, we will not, add another syllable, except to say, that if these evils are not instantly remedied, there is no alternative but to join our 449,000 countrywomen, and to implore the imperial legislature to annihilate the remaining term of apprenticeship, and to leave the planter no resource but either that of making his labourers happy, or of having his estates become once more a jungle. What Lord Glenelg and his colleagues think of these matters, we know not, except that they have disallowed various acts of the West Indian legislatures. After his Lordship's admirable despatches respecting the injustice exercised towards the South African tribes (especially the document alluded to and quoted from at p. 133 of our last Number), we cannot think that he is unmindful of their sable brethren, the inhabitants of the middle regions of that great continent, still suffering under the horrors of the slave trade, or of their relations in Barbados, Trinidad, and Demerara; and, indeed, *all* of them are bone of *our* bone, and flesh of *our* flesh; and for each, and all of them, did the Son of God equally die, as for ourselves, walking under the bright beams of the Gospel—of *the common salvation*. Personal liberty has no slight connection with the

privileges of the universal church, which God has purchased to himself, by the precious blood of his dear Son. As far as we refuse to give freedom to our slaves, when the boon, too, has been *promised and purchased*, and might be granted with security, we stand between them and the means of their salvation—the Bible, perhaps, in one hand, but the scourge in the other; and the poor victims are stupefied with astonishment at the sight of those who write the laws of Christianity in characters of blood.

P.S. Since writing the above, a discussion has taken place in the House of Lords upon a motion by Lord Brougham, relative to the slave trade and the West India apprenticeships. His Lordship proposed some resolutions for the repression of the former, and urged the extinction of the latter on the first of August ensuing. The House did not approve of all Lord Brougham's propositions with regard to the slave trade, but the great importance of the subject was acknowledged on every side; and her Majesty's Ministers pledge themselves to do all in their power to promote the object. With regard to the West Indies, Lord Glenelg fully admits the grievances to which we have above referred; and though he declines, and we think wisely, to break the compact of 1833 respecting the apprenticeship, as Lord Brougham proposed, he maintains that the local legislatures have refused to do their duty; that "nothing can be hoped for from them;" and that the time has arrived in which the imperial parliament is bound to take the question into its own hands, and to make such regulations as it shall think requisite. The proposed measures we trust will meet the chief evils complained of. He proposes, among other regulations, to give the special magistrates power to enter all places where apprentices are confined, and to examine into their cases; and the Governor, if he finds that any apprentice is suffering wrong, may enfranchise him summarily. Corporal punishment is also to be forbidden. We await the bill for particulars.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

The insurrection in Canada seems, for the present, through the mercy of God, nearly at an end. The rebels of the Upper province have broken up their entrenchment in Navy Island, and dispersed themselves in the United States, whence, for the most part, they had recruited their ranks, and procured arms and munitions of war. There have been some scenes of border interference and incursion, which might have led to hostilities between the two countries, had not the rulers of each been actuated by good faith and a friendly disposition. The affair of the Caroline steam-vessel, in particular, seemed perplexing, as the United States' borderers were highly incensed at the British having captured her within the limits of their territory; though nothing could be more equitable, as she was sailing under the British flag, and supplying men, provisions, and arms, to the rebels in Navy Island. The insurrection being quelled, good will spring from evil, if some plan can be devised for placing the affairs of British North America upon a satisfactory footing, so as to build up a strong and united colonial edifice. How this is to be achieved is not easy to divine, amidst the strongly-marked differences of opinion and interest which agitate the several sections of her Majesty's north-west dominions; but it will be necessary for the people of England to be vigilant in repressing the efforts of pseudo-liberalism to give undue influence to anti-British principles, more especially to the detriment of Protestantism in the Canadas.

Mr. Plumptre has given notice of a Bill for repressing Sunday-trading. We forbear offering any specific remarks upon the subject, till we see the details of the Bill. The piety and single-mindedness of Mr. Plumptre eminently fit him for the work which he has been led to undertake, and we feel confident that he would not be induced to propose any measure which he considers would entrench upon those scriptural principles respecting the Lord's-day, the straight-forward assertion of which it has pleased God so remarkably to honour and prosper. If the Bill, though attempting to repress only one most extensive class of violations, distinctly recognises, in all its scriptural latitude, the general obligation of keeping holy the Lord's-day, and embodies nothing that contravenes it, we do not think there is any sacrifice of principle in accepting and rejoicing in one portion of direct and positive good, though we cannot immediately gain all that we desire. But it is by the unflinching assertion of principle that the question has gained its present firm footing in public opinion; nor do we believe that even as respects legislation anything has been lost on this score, but quite the contrary.

The National Education question is still in abeyance in Parliament; but it begins to excite public attention, and we rejoice to say that the proposed infidel schemes are likely to be promptly and effectually repulsed. The Central Society propose a scheme of centralization, parochial school rates, and a perpetual commission; and that schools shall be entirely secular, in fact infidel; they even consider it one of the defects of the present Sunday School system, that arithmetic, geography, and science are not taught on the Lord's-day. They would have nothing to do with religion; and instead of singing hymns, they propose that the children should be taught (we quote literally) "Little Bo-peep," and the like! Lord Brougham however finds it necessary to yield to public opinion by admitting the reading of the Scriptures; and we are thankful even for this nominal recognition; but practically the provision is not of much value; for there is to be no religious instruction: the master and the governors may be Jews, Infidels, Papists, or any grade or mixture of Churchmen or Dissenters; and the most marked feature of all the proposed schemes is that the national schools shall not be connected with the Clergy or the Established Church. The powers of the commissioners would be almost despotic; and would soon either overwhelm or affiliate the great majority of schools; and as not only Mr. Simpson whom the Bishop of London quoted in the House of Lords, but other advocates of the proposed scheme, including Mr. Duppa himself, the secretary of the Central Society, advocate legislative coercion, our children would be torn away from the Church and trained in Infidel schools: for the evangelical dissenters would have no more power than the church; the British and Foreign School Society's bible-education plan being considered not less essentially sectarian, because Christian, than that of the national communion of England.

What, then, must be done? We have examined this question in all its lights, and feel convinced that disjointed and imperfect as is the present system of public education, the legislature cannot under existing circumstances interfere to amend it. All that it can wisely do is to continue to aid the National Society, for the Church; and, if it pleases, the British and Foreign School Society for the Dissenters. Religious instruction is indispensable; and that instruction must take some shape; the master must be of some creed; there can be no really neutral system; the Lancastrian plan, while it is opposed by a large body of the clergy as not satisfying the conditions of a religious education, is equally opposed by the leaders of what is called the "liberal" party, as perpetuating religious strifes, and making Romanists, Jews, and philosophers of all classes, pay a rate for what they do not approve. The liberals of the new Metropolitan University tried to prevent candidates for degrees being examined in the Greek Testament; because the professors of London University college do not lecture upon it; though a professor who does not believe that man has a soul, is allowed to teach the medical students materialism and infidelity; and, alas! as usual, the "evangelical Dissenters" sided with the Socinian and infidel minority—for, happily, so it has proved. Our readers will find the question ably discussed in a pamphlet, by "A Member of the Senate of Cambridge." On the general question, they may read with advantage Mr. Colquhoun's Letter on the Irish Education System; and also a short pamphlet by the Rev. R. Burgess of Chelsea, which exhibits, from the evidence before Parliament, the infidel character of the proposed plans; and a sermon by the Rev. H. Melvill, which discusses the question with Scriptural argument, set forth with his accustomed energy and eloquence.

There is one cause of popular obloquy in regard to Sabbath legislation, that it is said to affect the poor more than the rich; but it does not do so, except as gross public violations of the Lord's day may be more practised by the former than the latter; for as to the private actions of either, the poor man's house, or room, or cellar, is as much his castle as the proudest mansion in the land. But if it interfere with the poor man in the way of salutary restriction, it does so far more in the way of protection; for it removes from the labouring classes a yoke of grievous oppression. But the rich are the more bound to exercise self-denial, where law cannot interfere; and it is grievous to see how disgraceful an example they often exhibit; at once violating the laws of God, ruining their own souls, and causing an envious feeling in the minds of many of the poor, as if Sabbath-breaking were a sort of aristocratic privilege. What can the poor think of the sincerity of their richer neighbours in promoting salutary laws for the observance of the Sabbath, when they every week witness such scenes as the following, described by a clergyman of eminent piety, ability, and philanthropy, and whose birth and station entitle him to speak on the subject without any charge of invidiousness. How are they to distinguish the faithful followers of Christ in high places, from the large mass of those who flock to parks, or zoological gardens, or other scenes of Sabbath violation quite as criminal in the sight of God as the vulgar haunts of the Sabbath breaker in humble life; and some of which the law ought to visit as much as public-houses or open-shops. "Sabbath breakers by thousands," says that much-esteemed and indefatigable clergyman, the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, "are shewing, in the unspeakably insipid procession of gay equipages in Hyde-park, how well they can employ the bounties of God to insult him by their ostentatious violation of his express command. Then, when they have languished through the wearisome monotony of the holy day, they achieve at night, by luxurious banqueting, by gatherings of the beautiful and the gay, by the splendour of illumination, by music and song, an atheistical forgetfulness of God, shake off for a moment the ennui of fashionable existence, or disburthen themselves of the annoyance of conscience; while, as another valuable end, to refresh the memory on a dying bed, they effect the destruction of thousands, their unhappy dependants, who are sauntering at the doors of public-houses, while in attendance on their midnight revels. The poorer classes are not slow to follow their wholesome example." All this is deeply afflicting; but a Christian senator must not be deterred by it from endeavouring to rescue the poor man from the danger of some of his own peculiar temptations, (even at the risk of being accused of partiality) because it is not in his power to render the same service to the rich.

We have mentioned, in a former page, Lord Brougham's propositions upon the slave-trade and slavery. There was one particular in his plans which we ought separately to notice. Lord Brougham actually proposed to authorize her Majesty to issue licenses to individuals to fit out privateers to capture slave-vessels; that is, to put down one species of piracy by another; thus encouraging the atrocious system of buccaneering for private gain. Even inter-national war does not justify this barbarous and demoralizing practice of making a trade of blood for the purpose of plunder; and though slave-traders are common enemies, this is no reason why private merchants should be licensed to fit out naval armaments to massacre them for the sake of making money. We trust that some of Lord Brougham's Peace Society friends, in consequence of this extraordinary proposition, will get a bill brought into Parliament to render letters of marque and reprisal illegal. No right-minded conservative can complain that this would be to rob her Majesty of a prerogative which any Christian monarch could desire to preserve. We had hoped that even in the case of a war, public principle and feeling would not permit this outrage upon justice and humanity; but Lord Brougham's proposition shews that we judged too favourably. War, in all its shapes, is to be deprecated as a direful scourge which sin has inflicted upon our fallen humanity; but a cold blooded war for private emolument, is pre-eminently flagitious.

Having had occasion to allude to Lord Brougham, we cannot but lament that a man so highly gifted has so little mastery over his spirit. Contrast the frank, patriotic, forbearing, and noble-minded conduct of the Duke of Wellington, on the Canada question, with the sneering, pettish, splendidly oratorical but repulsive and undignified effusion of the ex-chancellor. Even those who think Lord Brougham right and the Duke wrong, admit that the one seemed to be thinking, How may I best serve my country; the other, How can I lash and vex my political apponents. And see the result in the position which

these two men occupy in the general estimation of their countrymen, without reference to the questions upon which they differ. The spectacle conveys a moral which ought not to be lost sight of either in public or private life. Men must often be engaged in matters which call forth adverse opinions; but personal happiness, public benefit, true policy, and above all the Gospel of the meek and lowly Saviour, require a total abstinence from bitterness and sarcasm. They are worthy only of a bad cause; a good one never in the end gains by them. The successes and failures of public men upon a large scale, if thus applied, would furnish many a homily for the conduct of Christians in private life.

Government having refused to grant a charter to the New Zealand Association, in consequence of the company's declining to comply with the conditions proposed, a Bill is to be brought into Parliament for effecting the object. This is fair; all that is asked for is due inquiry and publicity, which will now be ensured. We recommend the perusal of a pamphlet on the question, by Mr. Beecham, which contains much important fact and powerful argument.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. F. H.; Πιστις; J. B.; Clericus; F. S. P.; F. E. A.; W. C. B.; G.; A Candid Enquirer; W. W.; Zenas; J. E. G.; F. S.; Meta; C. P; W. S. H.; C. D.; G. N.; A Constant Reader; A Lover of Sobriety; Φιλαδελφος; and T. C.; are under consideration.

The Reverend Canon Bowles informs us that he has a most vivid recollection that his old poetical friend Coleridge told him, that the "Religious Musings" were written "in the tap-room, when the regiment was quartered at Reading;" and he thinks he added, on Christmas Eve. But the War-office books shew that Coleridge enlisted at Reading just before Christmas 1793, and was discharged at Hounslow in April 1794; and the poem, both in the manuscript and imprint, is dated Christmas Eve 1794. Possibly he then wrote out for press what he had mentally composed in the tap-room a year before; or he might not wish to record a painful date. We cannot doubt Mr. Bowles's accuracy; besides which the War-office mention of Reading tallies with the locality. We are much obliged also to Mr. Bowles for his anecdote of Bishop Burgess, which we will introduce in our notice of him. We never suspected that our venerable friend turned poet in his seventy-ninth year.

X. Y.'s thought was well worth versifying; but he has several non-rhymes (such as, *inscribe, prescribe; Cato, halo*), and several lines redundant or defective in measure; to correct all which would require more time than we could give, and greater alterations than he would perhaps approve.

Idle persons, who amuse themselves by sending anonymous scurrilous letters to periodical publications, waste their time and their double envelopes of paper; as the Post-office readily takes back such letters, and returns the postage.

A Poor Curate may have full confidence in the Clergy Mutual Assurance Society. It is under the patronage of all the bishops; and the profits go the assured, as the managers act gratuitously. Being conducted upon the principles of Provident societies, it is exempted from the stamp duties.

We are happy to say that C.'s remonstrance is rendered unnecessary, as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, at the suggestion of the Bishop of London, with the concurrence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, has rescinded the invidious phraseology complained of, and adopted the title, used by the parties themselves, of "the Scottish Episcopal Church."

There was no such objection as S. supposes. We approved of his remarks; but his paper was very long, and of long papers we cannot insert half that we receive; and on the subject of tradition, the Fathers, Oxford Tracts, &c., we have many more than we have room for. We choose those which appear to us the most suitable, meaning no offence to the writers of others.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. } No. 4. APRIL. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE SANCTIFYING EFFICACY OF AFFLICTION.

(*Concluded from* p. 149.)

For the Christian Observer.

THERE are two sorts of pleasure, not only generically different in their nature, but also diametrically opposite in their source and their tendency. There are the vanities of the world, and the corrupt solicitations of sensual objects, energized by Satan, and which seduce the affections *from* God: and there are, on the other hand, the counter attractions of spiritual consolations and joys, energized by the Divine Spirit, and which win the heart *to* God. That to wean the affections from the world, its peculiar pleasures should be embittered, is natural: but is there not, it will be asked, to counterbalance this, a continual influx of spiritual joys into the soul? To this, theory and experience answer negatively. Both declare that unalloyed happiness, even in the Divine life—I mean in duties, pleasures, and circumstances, of a nature purely religious—is not the privilege of man in his probationary state; and for this reason—because it is not the proper discipline and medicine of a sin-sick soul. The Gospel covenant is, peace in Christ amid tribulations in the world: and this is abundantly fulfilled in every sincere believer. But those elevations and enlargements of soul, those spiritual comforts, which God frequently indeed vouchsafes to his people; and with which, in the multitude of the sorrows they may have in their hearts, he graciously refreshes their souls; and gives them not merely peace in Christ amid tribulations in the world, but enables them to glory in tribulations also, and to count it all joy when they fall into divers temptations; these are not the medicines of a diseased soul, to heal its infirmities—and are therefore generally withdrawn, in severe mercy, on account of its unfaithfulness—but they are cordials to refresh and strengthen it. They are the wine which, though needful to the sinking frame, yet feeds the fever which is preying upon it. They are administered just in proportion to its natural weaknesses, to the peculiar service for which it is to be prepared, or to the magnitude and painfulness of the operation which the great Physician would perform in eradicating the core of sin, that wide-spread and firmly-rooted gangrene of the soul. The fragrant breath of spring may tempt the delicate and shrinking flower to put forth its tender buds;

the genial and kindly warmth of a summer's sun may tempt it fearlessly to expand its sensitive bosom, to receive the influx of his meridian glories; but it is winter's protracted, cheerless glooms and chilling frosts which alone (while they repress indeed its own luxuriance, and compel it, in alarm, to retreat with, and rally all its powers to the root and principle of life) can effectually wither and disentangle from it those noxious weeds which would exhaust its strength, diminish its fruitfulness, and deform or conceal its beauty. So also in the spiritual world: the light of God's countenance, shining unclouded upon the soul, may, and assuredly will, cherish and develope in it the graces of Christianity, and ripen the fruits of the Spirit. Then hope will bud; charity expand; and joy scatter profusely around the rich fruits of its luxuriant harvest. But it is the hiding of God's countenance; it is the winter of adversity; it is the furnace of affliction, and the heaviness of manifold temptations, which alone can bend the stubborn pride of the heart, can thoroughly disentangle it from the world's vanities, and sever the various links which chain it down to earth. These alone can check its evil propensities, and wither away its ever budding passions; can mortify its lusts, kill the root of all, selfishness, and thus crucify the old man. The sufferings of a crucified Saviour alone can conform us to His image; can break down, soften, and melt the soul, and thus prepare it to be delivered into the mould of the Gospel. Hence it is that the decree has gone forth, that we must be partakers of the death of Christ, if we would also be partakers of his resurrection—that we must be crucified with Christ, if we would live—that we must suffer with Christ, if we would also reign with him, and be glorified together.

If indeed sanctification were perfect and instantaneous, humiliations would be unnecessary; and the soul, restored to spiritual health, would doubtless be permitted, by its gracious Physician, to drink, constantly and without restraint, from the river of pleasures which is at God's right hand. Colonel Gardiner tells, and others have testified to a similar experience, that when plunged in every excess of dissipation and profligacy, and as the world emphatically, but falsely, terms it, *a man of pleasure*, he was so thoroughly wretched, that he envied the lot of the lower animals;—if indeed there is any animal lower than man when he has embruted his soul, and quenched in the mire of sensuality the heaven-lit fires of his higher nature;—but that, immediately on his conversion, a full tide of indescribable peace and joy flooded his soul, and continued with uninterrupted flow for many succeeding years. But let us remember that the work of *sanctification* in this remarkable person was not less either rapid or powerful. He tells us that his entire nature was thoroughly, and in a moment, regenerated; so that he possessed the purity of a new-born babe, and was delivered wholly, instantaneously, and abidingly, even from the corrupt solicitation of appetites and passions which, up to the period of his conversion, he thought it impossible that he could exist without gratifying.

There are then, it is freely admitted, consolations in Christ, and joys in the Holy Ghost—joys unspeakable and full of glory, which God himself, by his own presence, ministers immediately to the soul; not only without the vehicle of an earthly conveyance, but even when the adverse current of His providence is desolating the surface of the soul—joys and consolations which are purely spiritual, and so powerful that they enable it to take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in

necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake, and to glory in tribulations also. But even these ripe fruits of Canaan, which faith and hope are permitted to bring back to the soul, as earnests of the promised land, while it is doomed, through its manifold rebellions, to wander out of the way in the wilderness—even these purely spiritual enjoyments are not, I repeat, its proper food and medicine in this probationary state; but are graciously bestowed, as occasional and necessary cordials, to cheer, invigorate, and refresh it. *Experience* teaches that their object, generally, is to energize the soul for some arduous and important service, to support it under some painful affliction, or to strengthen it against some powerful temptation. It was to that chosen vessel from whom it pleased the Divine Head of the Church to pour out the refreshing streams of the Gospel upon the Gentile world, and the history of whose personal experience the Saviour himself, by prophetic anticipation, thus emphatically describes, "I will shew him how great things he must *suffer* for my name's sake"—it was to him, I say, that it was permitted, through the abundance of the revelations, to burst the cerements of the spirit's sepulchre, and, whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell, God knoweth, to be caught up into the third heavens, and to hear unspeakable words, which it is not possible for man to utter, or for the heart of man, while pent within the narrow prison of this earthly tabernacle, to conceive. It was those, too, who were selected to be the witnesses—shall I say companions?—of the Saviour, in his deepest humiliation and agony, whom he previously took up with him into a mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; and whom he thus selected to be witnesses—shall I again say companions?—of his anticipated glorification; thus strengthening their weak faith, and nerving their fearful hearts, and preparing them for the glooms of Gethsemane by the glories of Tabor.

Are, then, those deep heavings of the soul, those ardent aspirations of the spirit after perfect and unalloyed happiness, but vain and delusive—the sickly cravings of a diseased soul, whose appetites must never be satisfied: and however deeply creation may disappoint them, is not, at least, God a fountain of happiness, religion the channel of its unfailing stream? Is not, in fact, religion a principle of pure and unmixed enjoyment? Most assuredly it is; and every child of God, even at the lowest point of depression, knows this, and in the midst of sufferings without, and temptations within, "consents unto the law that it is good." Religion is indeed a principle of pure and unmingled happiness: but it is one which sin, and sin alone, within us and around us, can mar. It is sin alone, which, by impeding the free movements of the soul in the paths of holiness, can obstruct its free access to the fountain of bliss. Sin introduced suffering into God's holy and happy creation, where "all was very good;" and it is only with the cause that the effect shall disappear for ever. Sin was the fruitful parent of sorrow; and parent and offspring must flee together to the shades of everlasting night, self-excluded, as mists before the morning, from the realms of light, and holiness, and joy.

> ——— "Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden," ———

not only depraved the soul of him who sinned, and desolated the

paradise of his immediate habitation; but, diffusive as the all-pervading air, malignant as the poison on which philosophy speculates, whose single drop expanding would taint and destroy a world, has infected with its subtile venom the vast fabric of society, through its remotest labyrinths. Hence, the individual soul has not merely to strive against and groan beneath its own innate depravity and misery,—the very atmosphere which it breathes is polluted, the whole system in which it moves is impregnated, is saturated, with sin and misery. When the walls of this lesser house which entombs the soul are wholly taken down, and the earthly house of this tabernacle in which it groans, being burdened, is dissolved, and it is clothed upon with its house which is from heaven: when this corruptible body, which weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things, has been not only freed from its pains and infirmities, but purified from every corrupt solicitation, spiritualized and refined into a suitable vehicle of the soul; and that soul has itself become the undefiled temple of the Lord, an holy habitation of God, through the Spirit: when the church of Christ has been thoroughly purged, by the Searcher of hearts, from every intrusive guest who has not on the wedding garment—from every hypocritical impostor, and self-deceiving professor: when there is no longer an ungodly world to persecute the meek and unresisting follower of the Lamb, or with its filthy conversation and unlawful deeds to vex his righteous soul; but when the world at large has cast its idols, moral as well as material—not only its deified images, but its deified lusts—to the moles and to the bats; and the character of its most secular occupations, the stamp of its profanest vessels, is "holiness unto the Lord;" and all its officers are peace, and all its exactors righteousness: when the sting of death has been wholly extracted, the last enemy destroyed, and mortality been swallowed up of life: when death shall no more sound the alarm, and erect his sable banner in the midst of the social or domestic scene, and with a single arrow pierce so many hearts: when God again shall walk with man, in familiar converse, as in the days of primeval innocence, amid the shady bowers, and in the cool evenings of renovated paradise: in fact, when the vision of him to whom were revealed the things that shall be hereafter, is accomplished, and the mighty angel, "as told in the Apocalypse," shall come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow upon his head, and his face as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire, and shall set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot upon the earth, and cry with a loud voice as when a lion roareth, and shall lift up his hand to heaven, and swear by Him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven and the things that therein are, and the earth and the things that therein are, and the sea and the things which are therein,—that there shall be time no longer! when, in a word, time is eternity and earth is heaven! then, and not till then, shall those pains, in which the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together, be wholly removed: then, and not till then, shall we ourselves also which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, yet who groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body, exchange these groans of travail for hymns of joyous gratulation, which man, the high priest of nature, will be summoned by "mute and by material things," to offer up as incense to the all-disposing Parent of good. Then shall no jarring element of nature, no discordant temper of the soul, no voice of sorrow from amid the countless

varieties of animated nature, interrupt that calmly swelling chorus of harmony with which universal creation shall adore its God, and thus ebb back again into the Parent ocean of bliss the full tide of happiness which overflows it. Then shall there be a new heavens, and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, clothed again with its original robes of beauty and fragrance, and cleansed from those unsightly weeds and various defilements with which the curse deformed them; and instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle-tree, and the mountains and the hills shall break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands, and the wicked shall cease from troubling this happy scene, and the weary shall be at rest, and peace shall widely overspread her protecting wings, to shelter from every provocation and annoyance this family of brethren who dwell together in unity; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, nor shall there be any more pain, but God himself shall wipe away even the tears which memory would shed, from all faces.

But remember that to qualify us for enjoying the pure pleasures of a spiritual body and a regenerated world, a new faculty must be imparted by the Spirit of God; and that this faculty operates through the sanctification of the soul. Remember that we must be made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. As well might you hope to feast the sightless eyes with the exquisite beauties of the varied landscape, when lit up by the meridian glories of the summer sun, and then repose them upon its plains of verdure: as well might you hope to elevate his soul to nature's God, by inviting the blind to

> "Look, then, abroad thro' Nature, to the range
> Of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres,
> Wheeling unshaken thro' the void immense;"

when night, stretching her ebon sceptre o'er the earth, is enthroned in silent majesty, robed in her sable vest, crowned with her crescent diadem, and sitting beneath an azure canopy sparkling with ten thousand gems of light, which seem to the calmed and meditative spirit to open so many vistas into infinitude and eternity. In a word, as well might you expect nature to forget her instincts, and reverse her laws; the native of the watery element to sport amid the fragrant delights of the cultivated garden; or the winged inhabitant of air to plunge beneath the sparkling surface of the summer stream, and love to dwell amid its crystal waters, or to pour forth his melody mid coral groves and gloomy grottos "under the roots of ocean;" as that a soul impenitent, impure, unreconciled, should find happiness in a scene and a society over which the Holy God, with unsleeping eye, presides; should feed upon that light manna which is angels' food, and not lust after the flesh-pots of Egypt; should drink but of that river of pleasures which is at God's right hand, and be satisfied! No: unless humility, purity, charity, have strung that harp to which the redeemed from among men chant the song of Moses and of the Lamb, and attuned the soul to harmony with the beatitudes of heaven; unless Gospel grace has moulded it into the image of Christ; unless the love of the world and of the things that are in the world—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—has been crucified, and been succeeded by the love of things spiritual, holy, and Divine; unless the history of Christ has pierced the adamantine barriers of the heart of stone, thawed the chilling frost of selfishness, and melted the

obdurate spirit into the pure sentiment of holy, of Divine love; the heaven of which we idly talk would be to us a hell! Remember that the spiritual world, even now, surrounds us, glorious in simplicity, beauteous in holiness, joyous in serenity, eternally immutable, yet ever fresh and new; but that world can present to us, while unchanged, and unassimilated to it, but the same sad and gloomy features which met the eye of the prime apostate, when, blinded by sin to the vision of purity and innocence, and self excluded by the innate depravity of his fallen nature, from the realms of light and joy, he saw around him a

> ——— "dreary plain, forlorn and wild,
> The seat of desolation; void of light,
> Save what the glimmering of a livid flame
> Cast, pale and dreadful."

Let us, then, be content to accept the Gospel as a remedial system, and on the terms it proposes—in Christ peace, in the world tribulation. Then faith will not be staggered by suffering, in whatever degree such may be our lot, as though God had failed of His truth, and the Gospel had disappointed and deceived us. But, on the contrary, every hour of enjoyment, and even every exemption from suffering, as they are fresh sources of obligation, will prove new stimulants to love. Then we shall not think it a strange thing if the furnace of affliction try us, knowing that hereunto we are appointed; and that sanctified afflictions are links of that golden chain of love which must reunite a fallen soul to God: that "tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope" spiritual, holy love. Then will it be our daily study to let patience have its perfect work; and diligently to follow holiness; knowing that holiness, unobstructed, is happiness; and that without holiness no man can see the Lord.

J. M. H.

ON SABBATH-BREAKING IN HIGH STATIONS.

For the Christian Observer.

IN our Number for last June (p. 400), occurred the following observation: "Laud's advocates forget to tell their readers that under the Declaration of Sports even plays were acted on the day of sacred rest; and we think we may safely state the fact, though we cannot, at this moment, find time to search for a reference for it among original authorities, that the queen encouraged scenic entertainments at court on that day." In turning to the Wentworth papers, we observe a letter to Lord Strafford from the Rev. G. Garrard, dated February 7, 1637, which might have illustrated our remark. The writer says: "The French and Spanish ambassadors were both at the king's mask. It was performed on a Sunday night, the day after twelfth night." He gives as one reason why few people were present, though the court pressed it, that "the day was Sunday." He adds: "My Lord Treasurer was there by command."

We have no wish to renew a protracted controversy respecting Archbishop Laud; but we must say that he was mainly responsible for scenes like these. He was, at this time, in the very zenith of his power; his sway at court was all but absolute; his royal master was governed by him; and as for the queen, she was particularly under his influence, for it was chiefly by his intrigues that the king had been led

to marry her, much to the grief of the sober-minded of his subjects, who rightly anticipated that, as a Romanist and a daughter of France, she would endeavour to introduce into England the superstitions of her creed, the frivolities of her country, and the Sabbath-breaking of both, as accordingly happened; but Laud considered these as trifles compared with the contamination of German protestantism; for he had a determined purpose, throughout life, to undo much that Cranmer and his brethren, and their successors in the days of Elizabeth, had, by the blessing of God, effected; and to cut off England from all union with the protestant and reformed churches abroad (which he did not acknowledge to be churches), in order to bring her nearer to the creed and the ceremonials of Rome, under the abused name of catholic antiquity. One of the most specious methods by which this retrograde reform was to be effected, was by breaking down the Divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath; putting it merely upon a level with days set apart by the church; nay, in some sense, below them; for while, in order to expel puritanism, he induced the king to revive the ungodly edict of Sunday sports, he prosecuted, with merciless severity, any person who failed to observe a festival, or tasted forbidden meats on days of fasting appointed by human authority. Assuredly he had but to express an opinion, or a wish, in order to prevent such a scene of gross Sabbath violation at court as that alluded to in Garrard's letter; but how could he frown upon a Sunday mask in the palace, when he promoted rustic sports on the village-green? And, by the way, who was the Lord Treasurer, who allowed himself to grace the desecration? It was Dr. Juxon, Laud's confidential and subservient friend, for whom he had procured not only the bishoprick of London; but, against the remonstrances of the nation this secular post of high political influence and large emolument, respecting which, he says exultingly, in his diary, "No churchman had it since Henry the Seventh's time." But he imitated the policy—or, as it proved, the impolicy—of the papal church, of endeavouring to raise (rather degrade) clergymen to exalted civil and political offices; and he says, in his Diary, after succeeding in his intrigues for making the bishop Lord High Treasurer: "And now, if the church will not hold up themselves, under God, I can do no more." It may surely be inferred that Dr. Juxon would not have attended the Sunday mask if his powerful archiepiscopal friend and patron had not approved of it, especially as these Sunday desecrations at court were highly displeasing to the old-fashioned Anglican churchmen, who utterly disapproved of the Book of Sports, and of Laud's cruel and despotic proceedings towards the "Sabbatarians," as the Scriptural observers of the Lord's day were nicknamed. It is quite in character for Mr. Lawson, in defending Laud's conduct in getting a bishop made prime minister, which gave just offence to the nation, to say: "But with political enthusiasts everything is a crime which is not sanctioned by their party; and, with religious enthusiasts, that churchman is worldly-minded *who does not aid and encourage their spiritual rhodomontade;*" but it is not so well for Mr. Le Bas, writing in the name of the Christian Knowledge Society, to aid the attempt to palliate Laud's offences by telling us that it was only "rigorous religionists," "rigorous Sabbatarians," and men of "fanatical austerity," who made an "outcry," as he calls it, against the mandate of Sunday sports, thinking it "a dangerous concession to the Romanists, and a virtual

surrender of all Scriptural views relative to the sanctity of the day of rest." The Christian Knowledge Society is made to complain that by "the more rigorous Sabbatarians," "no better names could be found for it than a profane edict, a toleration for dishonouring the Lord's day, an unhallowed sacrifice of God's glory to the power of the king"—rather, of the archbishop. Looking back, coolly, two hundred years after the event, we can think of "no better names;" but our only business, at present, is with Mr. Le Bas's statement, that "whatever might be Laud's zeal against the Sabbatarians, the Lord's day was always most religiously honoured by him in his own person." As a great country, according to the Duke of Wellington's apophthegm, cannot have a little war; so an individual, placed in a station like that of Laud, whose power and influence exceeded that of the whole of the modern bench of bishops and of her Majesty's ministers together, cannot be a little Sabbath-keeper or a little Sabbath-breaker. When we know that Laud set his chaplain, Heylin, to write the most mischievous treatise ever penned against the Divine obligation of the Lord's day; that he cruelly prosecuted those of the clergy who scrupled to read, in the house of God, the "profane edict" for its profanation; that in the most intemperate manner he reviled and insulted the Lord Chief Justice at the council board, on account of what Mr. Le Bas is pleased to call his "injudicious zeal"—rather, his godly faithfulness—in sanctioning the proceedings of those magistrates who endeavoured to promote the observance of the Lord's day—in Mr. Le Bas's nomenclature, "the more austere principles;" so that the judge came out exclaiming that "he had been almost choked with a pair of lawn sleeves;" and even Mr. Le Bas is obliged to admit that this disgraceful scene presented "an unseemly spectacle;" when, further, we find a mask acted at court on Sunday, in the plenitude of his power and influence, and attended by his confidential friend and companion the Bishop of London, without the slightest trace of his ever having remonstrated against, or discouraged the proceeding: it is, at best, but a negative praise that he did not personally join in the revelry; which, at his advanced period of life, he might well have been excused doing, even if he had not been an archbishop.

But why, it may be asked, revive this story? We reply that we are not among those who account history an old almanac, except in the sense that an almanac is a useful old-fashioned book, which requires only to be adapted, from time to time, to the phenomena of successive dates. The great principles of calculation are unchangeable; it is merely their application that needs adjustment. The same causes will produce the same effects; and if the almanac tells us truly that the sun, moon, and earth will be in a line next year, we may rely upon it that there will be an eclipse as surely there was when history tells us that on former occasions the event corresponded to the prediction. Hostility to the commandments of God is not confined to any one age or nation; and no portion of them is more irksome to the temper of the unhallowed heart than that which says, "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day." We have had occasion to write much respecting those violations of this day, to which the subordinate ranks of society are chiefly tempted, though encouraged and instigated, in many cases, by persons in higher stations, as in Sunday trading and Sunday travelling. But important as it is that these should be sup-

pressed, so far as legislation can be equitably brought to bear upon them, it is of far greater importance that persons in higher stations should set a good example, and also that the ministers of religion should uphold the Divine and perpetual obligation of the institution. At the present moment, though there is an increased attention to the Sabbath, there is also an increased violation of it; that is to say, good and evil are contending for the mastery; the urgent representations of religious persons have induced many to a more decent observance of the external duties of the Lord's day; while the unblushing effrontery of wickedness has emboldened others in their desecration. The barriers are being thrown down on every side. The poor violate the day by buying, selling, or what is misnamed pleasure-taking; the rich find their pleasure in other ways, but equally in violation of the sacred rest; even in parliament a grave minister of state, Mr. Spring Rice, has urged the great advantage of going to admire the monkeys, and feed the elephants, and pet the macaws, at the Zoological Gardens on the Sabbath; a practice which required no stimulus, as already on every fine summer Sunday three rows of carriages are jammed, in slow procession, for some two miles, to grace the spectacle. Then we have railroad excursions, by way of committing "the oldest sins the newest kind of ways:" and one peculiarity, which adds greatly to the enormity of this new violation, is, that its perpetrators are more wicked with less temptation; for the greater the facilities of travelling, the less semblance of excuse is there for violating the sanctity of the Sabbath. If a traveller can perform in two or three hours, on Saturday night or Monday morning, a journey which formerly demanded the sacrifice of the greater part of a day, the railroad, which enables him to redeem the time for business, enables him also to redeem it for his soul and for God.

Under these circumstances, we repeat, the admonitions of the pulpit, and the example of persons of high rank and influential station, are of essential importance. And here again we have to lament that the efforts of those who desire to witness the due observance of God's holy day, are grievously impeded; for while, on the one hand, certain divines, of the school of Heylin, are contending that there is not any warrant for the Christian Sabbath but that of ecclesiastical authority, and are thus rejecting the only sanction which is of any effectual avail in public estimation; the men of the world, who care nothing for their church censures, are very thankful for their aid in repelling the Scriptural arguments of the "rigid Sabbatarians." Would that the sacred claims of God's holy day could penetrate through the crowds of Sabbath-breakers who inhabit the high places of the land, and force their way to the precincts of the throne itself. Then would not the nation have had the affliction of seeing their ingenuous youthful queen hurried, on the eve of the Sabbath, to the play or opera; and next day, after a brief parenthesis of Divine worship, to the Sunday drive, and the dinner and evening party, amidst the fascinations of military music and the festive distractions of a palace. Public opinion on this vital subject, must extend its influence upwards and downwards. It is true, that both among the lowest and the highest there are those who feel the value of the Christian Sabbath, and enjoy its blessed duties; but, for the most part, it is in the middle classes of life that the greatest degree of religious susceptibility is evinced; and it is the duty of this large and influential portion of society to exert itself to correct the

vices of the poor, and the frivolities of the rich; the desecrations of beer-houses and patrician clubs; of tea-gardens and parks; of hucksters' stalls and courtly drawing-rooms.

CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY'S SELECTIONS FROM THE REFORMERS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

PERMIT me to urge your readers to circulate widely the selections from the "Reformers and Fathers of the Church of England," issued by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, as an excellent antidote to the poison of various modern publications. I will select two instances in the very first Number, which consists of "Extracts from Tyndal's Prologue to the five Books of Moses."

At page 16 of this useful tract we read that the Lord's Supper "is properly no sacrifice, but a sacrament, and a memorial of that everlasting sacrifice once for all offered." "A memorial," or commemoration of that sacrifice; not "a commemorative sacrifice," as some assert; and among them Mr. Keble, who says that the doctrine of "the blessed eucharist, as a commemorative sacrifice," is to be received "apart from all Scripture evidence," as "a traditionary or common law ecclesiastical." It certainly must be received, if received at all, "apart from Scripture;" for Scripture teaches no such doctrine as that we offer up Christ to God the Father, either cruently or incruently, in the Lord's Supper; and it must be received equally apart from the Articles and Offices of the Church of England, which acknowledge no such "traditionary, or common law ecclesiastical."

In the very next page of this tract from Tyndal, we read, "The use of allegories is to declare and open a text, that it may be the better perceived and understood; as when I have a clear text of Christ and the Apostles that I may be baptized, then I may borrow an example of circumcision to express the nature, power, and fruit, or effect, of baptism." Here we learn the Scriptural analogy between circumcision and baptism, the former pointing out the "nature, power, fruit, and effect," of the latter; according to which explanation the old Fathers were regenerated as truly as Christians are, which has been of late denied.

I earnestly hope that there will be so large a demand for the Society's extracts from the Reformers, that encouragement will be given to print large portions of their writings. It is of great importance that people should have free access to the eminently Scriptural pages of these wise and holy men; especially now that such strenuous efforts are made to bring into notice a second school of writers who were not the Fathers, or genuine representatives, of the Church of England.

BERNARD.

ON THE ALLEGORIZINGS OF THE FATHERS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Do not be shaken by the "voluntary humility" of the argument of late so urgently employed: "How should we know that such a pas-

sage of Scripture means so and so, but for the Fathers?" If the "so and so" is solid, we need be under no alarm in answering that question; for we have the inspired text; we have also the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit as much as the Fathers had; and we have an invaluable apparatus of biblical learning and criticism, which they were destitute of; so that, in the interpretation of Holy Writ, we come behind them in nothing, and we are before them in many things; more especially in being free from those heathen prejudices in which most of them were educated, and which, too often, after their conversion, tinged their views of the Christian dispensation. If their interpretation is sound, we have ample means of arriving at it; but if false, fanciful, or superstitious, the weight of their names cannot make it otherwise. We have our prejudices, as they had theirs; and ours may be equally strong, though in a different direction; but we are under no temptation, as some of them were, to Judaise or Paganise any part of Christianity, in order to adapt it to preconceived opinions, or to render it palatable to unbelievers.

I am led to trouble you with these remarks, in consequence of observing a striking passage upon the fanciful allegorizings of some of the Fathers, in Bishop Heber's Life of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Bishop Heber, I am sure, expressed the general opinion of most of his contemporaries at Oxford, many of whom, like himself, have risen to high stations, ecclesiastical and civil; and I am astonished to hear that of late some members of that learned university have expressed very extravagant opinions relative to the deference with which the opinions and interpretations of the ancient Christian writers ought to be received. Bishop Heber says:

"There were other causes which tended still more to corrupt the taste of the preachers; of which the first was that of fondness derived from the cabbalistic Jews, of detecting an internal sense in the plainest passages of Scripture; and still more, the custom of applying such passages, 'by way of accommodation,' to subjects the most foreign from their known meaning,—of which a good many instances may be found in Jerome; in succeeding Fathers still more; and, most of all, in the divines of what are called the dark ages.

"Thus, when Jerome, in his Epistle to Fabiola, allegorizes the different ornaments of the Jewish high priest into the different virtues and graces of a Christian; when Athanasius finds out the penitent thief on the cross, in the second verse of the second chapter of Habakkuk; when Gregory the Great makes Jericho at once a symbol of the moon and of our mortal nature; and, above all, when Bernard derives the word diabolus from 'two pockets;' it is difficult to believe that they can have intended these fancies as argumentative, or to prove to their hearers any thing but the talents and acuteness of their teachers. Such, however, were the favourite ornaments of Christian orators for a long lapse of ages; and this taste, which, of course, by degrees degenerated into mere quibbling, was not yet extinct, as we learn from Echard's 'Contempt of the Clergy,' in England, during the life of Taylor, and prevailed, if we may believe the author of 'Fray Gerundio,' in Spain at a much later period."—*Heber's Life of Jeremy Taylor*, vol. i. pp. 257, 258.

To understand the above allusion to Athanasius, it is necessary to observe that the words in Habakkuk ii. 11, which we translate "the *beam* out of the timber," are rendered in the Septuagint "the *beetle* out of the timber;" upon which Athanasius observes that "the prophet spoke of the thief upon the cross, when he said, '*the beetle out of the wood shall put forth a voice.*' Ye know, my brethren, that the beetle, being unclean, is concerned in unclean work; so also this thief was versed in thieving; but, being upon the cross, he makes confession, as was foretold, and in him is fulfilled what was prophesied." The passage, in Bernard, alluded to, is as follows: "Would that in every twelve

pastors there were found one Peter; one who left all things; one who had not two pockets. One of you, says Christ, is a devil (*diabolus*). Now *diabolus* is derived from *duobus bolis*; and Judas had not one pocket but two." Bernard's meaning is good, that a minister of Christ should not make a gain of godliness; but his etymology is not binding upon us.

It may be said that such fancies do no great harm, any more than Mr. Newman's informing his rustics, at Littlemore, in a sermon of the admirable pattern which he had followed in the erection of his new church; the windows representing the twelve apostles; the seven arches the pillars of the church; the window of three divisions the mystery of the Trinity, and so forth; but experience proves that such allegorizings, worthy of "what are called the dark ages," will always, in less superstitious times, generate "contempt of the clergy;" and with it contempt for religion, on the part of those who cannot, or will not, distinguish between God's infallible truth and man's fallible comments.

ARCHIPPUS.

*** Several correspondents, in order to shew how unfit the Fathers are to be trusted as safe guides, much less as authorities, have referred us to unsound or injudicious passages in their writings—and we could add largely to the number; but we adhere to the determination which we have so often expressed, of not being induced to disparage those holy, though fallible men, just because some persons have injudiciously elevated them upon a pedestal, which exposes their defects to the public gaze. The above extract from Bishop Heber, may serve as a specimen of what might be easily expanded into a volume. As authorities we deny their claim; or, rather, the claim set up for them by others; but we have no pleasure in exposing their failings, for they were zealous and faithful servants of our Lord, and many of them sealed their testimony with their blood.

NOTE ON 1 THESSALONIANS IV. 6.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE Epistle for last Sunday (the second Sunday in Lent), which is taken from 1 Thess. iv., reminded me of a discourse I once heard preached upon the sixth verse, "Let no man go beyond and defraud his brother, in *any* matter," &c., from which the preacher took occasion to point out various kinds of frauds; such as commercial frauds, religious frauds, and political frauds. Without referring to the Greek, our authorised translation might have convinced him that the text will not bear out his comment; for the word "any," on which he laid the chief stress of his discourse, is printed in italics, as not being in the original; and the margin reads correctly "in the matter;" that is, the matter which the apostle was treating of, both in the foregoing and following verses, which relate not to sins of ordinary fraud, but of licentiousness; to injuring our neighbour, not in property, but his affections. To make the passage a duplication of the eighth commandment, deprives it of its peculiar energy as an enforcement of the seventh.

M. G.

CAMBRIDGE MUTILATIONS OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE late eccentric rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, when preaching before the University, about thirty years ago, after having spoken of German criticism in no very complimentary terms, added: "Give me a good English Bible *cum privilegio.*" I rejoice with the learned doctor at the wise arrangement by which the privilege of printing our Bibles and Prayer Books has been confined within narrow bounds: and am, therefore, particularly jealous that it should not be abused; which, it appears to me, to have been, in the case I am now about to bring before your readers.

The churchwardens of my parish have recently provided me with a new book of "the offices." It is entitled, "The Offices, according to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland; with an Appendix, containing useful directions for the discharge of the above Offices, and other Articles relative to the Ministerial function. Cambridge: Printed by John Smith, Printer to the University. *Cum privilegio.* 1833."

In this book, the greatest—and, as I conceive, the most unwarrantable—liberties are taken with the rubrics. Many are altogether omitted. In other cases, two are amalgamated into one, part of each being omitted. In others, important words are omitted: and, in some, the words and meaning are altogether changed. Of this latter kind a striking instance occurs at the end of the Communion Service. The noble hymn, "Gloria in excelsis," being ended, the church directs, "Then the priest (or bishop, if he be present) shall let them depart with this blessing." Whereas, in my Book of Offices, after this hymn, a new rubric is given—"Collects to be said one or more after the Communion by the discretion of the minister;" then follow the six collects, and after them the rubric, "Then the priest, &c.," and the final blessing. Now this is not only an unauthorised alteration of the rubric; but an alteration decidedly for the worse. The compilers of the Liturgy had too much judgment and right feeling in such matters to direct us, after that thanksgiving, to return to collects. The *true* rubric does not say that they are to be read *after the Communion*, as the *false* rubric does. But it directs that they are, "to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion; and may be said after the *Collects* of Morning or Evening Prayer, Communion, or Litany, by the discretion of the minister." But the placing the collects before, instead of after the blessing, as well as the garbling the rubric, shews that the change was wilful—a change which those who authorized it may think an improvement; but which every one who feels and judges rightly in the matter, will condemn.

I might mention many other instances of unauthorized alterations; but I will content myself with one more, which is, as I conceive, also a perversion of the intention of the compilers of our Liturgy, or, as perhaps I should rather say, of the Church. In the Marriage Service the *true* Rubric stands thus: "At the day and time &c., the persons to be married shall come into the body of the church, with their friends and neighbours; and there standing," &c. In the Book of Offices the words "with their friends and neighbours" are omitted. It was wisely intended that this holy ceremony should be performed in the

presence of friends and neighbours, who would not only be witnesses, but also would feel an interest and join heartily in the prayers of the Church, on the occasion. Modern fastidiousness has in many cases made people desirous of avoiding the congregation; and the Cambridge press, siding with the morbid feelings of the times, instead of encouraging the better feelings and devotions of the Church, condescendingly omits the obnoxious direction in the Rubric.

I have alluded to the above, among many other alterations, as being, in my opinion, wilful perversions. With regard to omissions and condensations, I am aware that it may be said that in a book intended merely for the officiating clergyman, it was not necessary to insert the whole of the rubrics; but only such parts as might serve in directing him in the office. But it is extraordinary that some rubrics, important as *directions*, are omitted—such, for example, as those relating to the disposal of the consecrated and unconsecrated bread and wine after the communion. And after all, if the rubrics had been inserted entire, they would not have increased the size of the book by more than one leaf.

To shew the carelessness with which such things are sometimes managed, I need only mention that in the "Appendix containing useful Directions," &c., printed in 1833, we are favoured with "the form of a certificate of a person having been buried in woollen;" the Acts which required this having been repealed in 1814.

W. E. H.

A CLERGYMAN'S REASONS FOR NOT ATTENDING BALLS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE drawn up the following as a clergyman's reasons for not attending balls. The subject ought to be brought forward, in order that all those who abstain from such scenes may have a ready reason and answer for any of their worldly friends who may demand one. It is an inconsistency that any man should subscribe to circulate Bibles, Prayer-books, and such works as Law's "Serious Call" and Scougal's "Life of God in the Soul of Man," and yet attend places set apart for vain display and equivocal pleasures. Alas! "how sad a sight is human happiness!" that is, of *such* happiness; for there is happiness—real happiness—even upon earth; otherwise Scripture would not so often command us to rejoice; and the Christian tastes that felicity when he walks in the paths of heavenly wisdom, which are pleasantness and peace, rejoicing with sobriety, but rejoicing heartily in the strength of his salvation, and cheered by hopes beyond the grave.

In relation with the good hope and happiness of the Christian life, are the following reasons offered in justification, if to any well-regulated mind such justification be necessary, of non-attendance in the ball-room, or any place of light and vain diversion; and the author submits them to the sober judgment of those who would not choose to live without some feelings of veneration for our holy religion.

A CLERGYMAN'S REASONS FOR NOT ATTENDING BALLS.

1. Because profession without practice is nothing worth.
   "He can't be right whose life is in the wrong."
2. Because it is inconsistent with the characteristics of the Christian

profession, as laid down in the sermon on the mount, and with the doctrine of renewal of heart, and the precepts to cultivate charity.

3. Because the name and commandments of my Master would not be received there, before all other things, with joy.

4. Because it is at total variance with spiritual rejoicing, and a sober yet glad walk in the ways of pleasantness; but is in accordance with that worldly rejoicing which the Scriptures in very many parts condemn.

5. Because infidels, if of pleasing manners, are equally hailed there; and the hypocrite is not discountenanced.

6. Because so far from promoting social and spiritual union, it tends to various words and acts of uncharitableness, and too often to envy and slander.

7. Because I have seen the worldly temper which is the sure consequence of attendance on places set apart for vain display.

8. Because it is not, by God's word, a rational or lawful recreation, and is generally formed for those whose whole life is a continued idleness.

9. Because I firmly and practically believe in the communion of saints, and that it is not begun or cherished in a ball room.

10. Because it is opposed to the requirements in my baptismal vow.

11. Because it must hinder my attention to the obligations of the Service for the ordering of Priests, especially in "laying aside the study of the world and the flesh;" the being "a wholesome example and pattern to the flock of Christ;" the remembrance that the dancing figures around me "are the sheep of Christ, which he bought with his death, and for whom he shed his blood:" and blots out the mindfulness "that if it shall happen the same church, or any member thereof, take any hurt or hindrance by reason of my negligence, I must know the greatness of my fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue."

12. Because I see no clergymen go there but those who are thought lightly of both by spiritual and worldly persons, and whom none would call to their dying bed; whereas men of spiritual attainments and scriptural knowledge, who are visibly known by their fruits in a holy and sincere walk, and who thus practise what they preach, always absent themselves.

13. Because balls usually take place at Christmas, the anniversary of our Lord's birth; at Easter, the anniversary of his glorious resurrection; and at Whitsuntide, the anniversary of the descent of the Holy Spirit;—all which events our Church connects with the crucifixion of Christ, by administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at those sacred periods.

14. Because the amusement is at any time unbefitting a "partaker of the Divine nature," a "temple of the Holy Ghost," which every Christian's body must necessarily be.

15. Because the poor and ignorant call for all our time, and all our alms; and unjustly do we interfere with their coarser and most immoral relaxations, when ours are but ruled by the restraints, not of religion, but more refined society.

16. Because the festival called a "charity ball" leads to much delusion and hypocrisy; the outlay on the world being great, and not a tenth, often not a hundredth, and sometimes not a fraction of the

receipts finding its way to the charity. Thus the frequenter of the "charity ball" has less to bestow that year in real charity than if he had not patronised it—and consequently the poor are sufferers.

17. Because balls have a decided tendency (and if they had but the smallest, they should be avoided) to foster vanity, and few sins are more often and condignly threatened with the displeasure of the Almighty, than the passion of vanity.

18. Because where a doubt arises in any matter of practical conduct, the Gospel, and not the world, should receive the benefit of that doubt from every sincere lover of God.

19. Because the above sentiments from the earliest ages of the Church have been maintained alike by the old Catholic bishops and fathers, and by the most distinguished Churchmen of modern times; and the same elevated standard is given in the body of our ecclesiastical law, compiled by thirty two commissioners, in the time of Edward the Sixth, and published under his royal authority.

CLERICUS FELIX.

*** We should have thought that the very title of our correspondent's paper contains in itself a sufficient reason—"I am a clergyman;" and even in the case of laymen a spiritual mind requires but one consideration—"These things are not of the Father, but of the world;" and to those who are not spiritually-minded, arguments drawn from religious motives will have no weight. What they need is a renewal of heart; a conversion to God. As, however, we fear it is a fact that some clergymen do attend balls, though our pages are not very likely to fall into their hands, we insert our correspondent's arguments, though they ought to be superfluous.

ON THE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF SCRIPTURE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

DEAR SIR,—A friend of mine, having at my request prepared a new Chapter for a fresh edition of my "Scripture Help," and it appearing to me likely to be interesting and useful to the readers of the Christian Observer, and calculated to lead to an enlarged and profitable study of the Scriptures, I send it to you for insertion. May you have grace and wisdom for all the exigencies of these times, and may your labours be an increasing blessing to the Church.

Watton Rectory, Herts. E. BICKERSTETH.

[We are glad to see that Mr. Bickersteth's excellent and justly popular "Scripture Help," which has been gradually enlarged from a small treatise to a work of four hundred pages, now appears before the public in a seventeenth and greatly improved edition. As a large number of the possessors of the former editions will not have the advantage of perusing the valuable paper with which Mr. Bickersteth has favoured us, we avail ourselves of his permission to lay it before our readers. Among Mr. Bickersteth's recent publications, we observe a reprint of Coverdale's "Letters of the Martyrs;" a work of intense interest, and breathing the genuine spirit of the Protestant reformation; and which is on many grounds peculiarly seasonable at the present moment. Mr. Bickersteth has also published a worthy companion to it in his "Christian's Family

Library;" in a well-executed abridgment of Fox's Martyrology by that zealous, devout, and highly-gifted lady who writes under the name of Charlotte Elizabeth.]

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work. Such is the testimony of the Spirit of God, to the purpose and fulness of the Scriptures which he has inspired, in an Epistle specially addressed to the last times. If, then, we see Christians in generalad vancing slowly, or scarcely at all, towards this high standard, it is not because the word of God has grown powerless, but for want either of faith, or diligence in its use, or else of wisdom to use it aright. The former of these three great requisites, each Christian for himself must cultivate as bounden duties, and earnestly seek as gifts from God: in the last, though alike a Divine gift, yet our experience or the light of one may be a help to another. Each different age requires a fresh unfolding of the same great truths, and in a different order, according to the varying forms of evil. The present seems on the verge of one of these chief transitions, as the visible church is passing fast from the superstitious and self-righteous to the latitudinarian or infidel form. A few remarks then on the most profitable order of study, if offered and received in humility, may prove a help to those who desire to have the word of Christ dwelling in them richly, and to be clothed with the whole armour of God, that they may be able to stand fast in the evil day. The right manner of this study of God's word, and its sure success, the Spirit of God declares in Prov. ii. 1—7, *Sound wisdom is laid up* for the righteous; it is the will of God that we should draw largely out of this heavenly store, and bring out of this treasury things new and old. We must believe largely, and ask earnestly, and we shall obtain abundantly. 'Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it.'

"The parts of God's word first directly addressed to us, were THE EPISTLES, and they hence first claim our attention. The church indeed, for some time past, has attended too exclusively to these, and, like members of the body, being severed from other Scripture, they have lost much of their power, and leave us in danger of deceiving ourselves with theological terms and fictions, instead of the living realities of the Gospel. But as they are directly addressed to the Gentile churches, they plainly claim our immediate study. They are Christ's own code of instructions, given to his church among the Gentiles. And besides, as each part of the spiritual temple must dovetail into the rest, the fact of their forming the prevailing study of Christians in the present and last generations of the church, points them out as the first step in all wider researches in the word of God.

"The leading view we are to take of the Epistles, is as a glorious first-fruits, like the cluster of grapes borne by the twelve spies of Israel, of that state of pure, fervent, sincere, universal love, to which it is God's purpose, in Christ Jesus, to raise our fallen and sinful world. They are thus a pure gleam of light, to shew us in lively foretaste the blessedness of those good things to come, of which Christ is the great high-priest. The oath of God is pledged that the whole earth shall yet be filled, deep as the waters cover the sea, with the fervent heavenly love, which breathes and burns in every line of these holy writings. Then, and not till then, will the kingdom of God, in the highest sense, come with power. What a vast and glorious hope! How should we earnestly long for its speedy fulfilment and consummation!

"The Epistles themselves, however, are exceedingly various in their character. Hence at different seasons of the church, their comparative practical use may vary. The same reason which led the Spirit, by the apostles, to address to different churches such different aspects of truth, must still apply in their practical use to ourselves. By comparing 1 Cor. ii. and Heb. v. with the epistle to the Ephesians, we may be convinced how much wisdom and judgment are needed even here, in choosing for especial study those epistles, which apply best to our actual state and present dangers. The same cause which turns away so many from God's word entirely, may lead Christians of weak faith to prefer sweets to medicine, and turn them from those parts which are most needful, to feed on other truth which is not in due season. A few remarks then, by God's help, may be given on each in succession.

"The epistle to the Romans is the most full and connected exhibition of the theory of the Gospel and the Gentile dispensation, but is designed expressly as the antidote to Jewish self-righteousness, then at its height, and to the same spirit in the Gentile church, which was still in its germ. At the time then, when first penned, and at that of the Reformation, it may be justly deemed first of all

the Scriptures in practical worth. The case is now very different. Other dangers have arisen; in the church a fancied completeness of the knowledge of the Gospel; in the world, simple unbelief; and to meet these, other parts of Scripture, and even other epistles, are more needed. There is perhaps no part, in which we might now more readily mistake an intellectual form of truth for the living substance, while resting in contented ignorance of the great body of Scripture. The church is now groaning under this evil. Its chief immediate use seems to be as an antidote to the Pelagian leaven which still lurks in high places. But it is not the part which is to meet most effectually the liberal and infidel spirit of the times. Against rampant and open Popery it is all-powerful; democratic Popery needs to be resisted by other weapons.

"The two epistles to the Corinthians are perhaps the most suited of all to the present wants of the church. This appears on their face; for when was the church more divided than now? When was it more content with a fancied knowledge, without the fruits of union and love? And these are the evils the Spirit expressly intends these epistles to meet. By their irregular form, they serve to beat down the pride of fancied and rational systems. By their allusions to the Old Testament, they teach our scanty knowledge of Scripture, and lead us by the hand to a more enlarged research. They bring down religion into all the practical relations of social life and public worship. The variety of such topics is indeed surprising. In a few pages they teach the duties of ministers and people; of Christian brethren to an offending brother, and to unbelievers; of husbands and wives: the sacredness of children, as sharers in the covenant: the sacraments of the church; the reverence due to the house of God; the decorum of worship; the right exercise of liberality; the study of honesty in the sight of men; the lawful mention of gifts and privileges; the tenderness of love; the depth of true repentance; comfort in death, and the assurance of the resurrection. They are thus a perfect treasury of practical wisdom, adapted to an infant and divided state of the church. The doctrines of the Gospel, the grace of Christ, the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Spirit, are so mingled with the reality of human feelings in the heart of the Apostle, and in such varied forms of tenderness and earnest affection, as to imbue the soul insensibly like the dews of heaven.

"The Epistle to the Galatians is next in order. The character of this closely resembles the epistle to the Romans, and the same remarks apply to it in a great measure. At the time of the Reformation, its immediate worth to the church was inestimable, and a great means of promoting that blessed work. Luther wrote no less than three commentaries on this epistle. And its practical value is still the same, wherever the tendency to will-worship and the leaven of self-righteousness re-appears. This, however, is not the master-evil of the times, and the practical use of this epistle is therefore less immediate, compared with others. Other views of it, in the important links it supplies with the Old Testament, may be suggested in our further progress.

"The Epistle to the Ephesians is very distinct in character from the other epistles of St. Paul, and bears a closer resemblance to those of St. John; only that the spirit of love in the one is more fervent and diffusive, and in the other more calm and heavenly. They may be viewed together, and along with the gospel of St. John, as the highest forms of sacred truth, like the crown of pure gold about the ark of the covenant. Of evil they speak little; it seems left far behind, at the foot of the mount where these saints hold communion with God; as though a door were opened in heaven, and a voice were heard saying to us, 'Come up hither.' As exhibiting, then, the high standard of Christian experience, and the glimpses of a heavenly love, far above the present state of the church, and yet to which we should aspire, it is indeed invaluable. But perhaps its immediate profit is much less than its intrinsic beauty and glory.

"The Apostle clearly gives it as a pattern, Eph. iii. 3—5, of that strong meat which belongs to those of full age. As, in the natural world, there is a distance within which a body must approach, ere it can catch the electric fire, so there is in spiritual things, a high and unearthly state of heart, far beyond the usual growth of Christians now, to come within the full influence of the truths unfolded in this epistle, and even to apprehend the depth of its meaning. Who can read the last eight verses of the first chapter, and not feel that it describes a state which Christians have in this day by no means attained, and have scarcely the spiritual faculties to understand? So also of the last seven verses of the third chapter. The most advanced Christians in this day have little more than the shadow of these truths; their experience in the living reality, is the last and most glorious fruit of Divine grace in its highest forms. The present value of

this epistle to the church is therefore less than that of others, which it exceeds in its intrinsic glory.

"The Epistle to the Philippians, and the first to the Thessalonians, are as the code given by the Spirit of God, for more private and select, as those to the Corinthians for more mixed and public, Christian communion. They are the pure overflowings of fervent love; short, easy to be remembered, full of practical exhortations, counsel and wisdom, and yet containing the sweetest statements of the Gospel; the sufferings and death of Christ, as the ground of humility; his return and glory, as the motive to watchfulness, and the ground of comfort, peace, and joy. They form a Divine manual for the religion of the heart, the love of Christ overflowing in love to the brethren.

"The Epistle to the Colossians holds a middle place between these and that to the Ephesians. The love it breathes is of a sphere between those of the others, more heavenward than the former, more uniformly practical than the last. Our present hold upon its truths is too weak and faint, to give to it that immediate weight, which belongs to its essential beauty.

"The second Epistle to the Thessalonians is worthy of peculiar notice. It is addressed to the church most closely united in simple faith and brotherly love. It is a sequel to the most affectionate, plain, and perhaps most practical of all the epistles in the canon. It is designed to correct, in this simple and beloved flock, a misconception which had sprung from the former. And yet it is nothing but a brief summary of the prophecies of the books of Daniel and Revelation. The Spirit of God seems to have designed thus to point out to us what parts of his word would more directly be needed, to ensure the practical benefit of the Epistles, and to prevent them from giving rise, through the neglect or ignorance of the church, and the decay of its faith and love, to the most grievous mistakes and delusions. In this appears to lie its immediate use and value; it can only be read, in its full meaning, by the fires of martyrdom.

"The epistles to Timothy and Titus refer chiefly to the ministerial office. The objects of each, however, are distinct, though the full exhibition of this difference requires us to have entered in some degree into the second part or branch of scripture study, on the various stages of the Gentile church. We may observe, in general, that the first is directed against the evils of the latter times or Papal superstitions, under the guise of the Divine authority of the church; the ascetic will-worship of monks; the laborious trifling of schoolmen; the self-righteous perversions of the law; the selfish and cold-hearted contraction of the Gospel within an exclusive pale; the covetousness of a corrupt priesthood. The second is aimed against the perils of the last days; the infidel form of selfish apostacy; the secret or open contempt of Divine ordinances; the loosing of the bonds of society; the loveless and heartless mockeries of religion; the selfish and unfeeling desertion of offices of love; the undermining, under spiritual pretences, of the great promises of the Gospel; and, as the root of the whole, the practical disbelief of Old Testament scripture, as all given by God's inspiration, and the denial of Christ in the character of the son and seed of David. The epistle to Titus embraces more general instructions. The short letter to Philemon is a brief pattern of that genuine and exquisite courtesy in our intercourse with individuals, which flows from the power of Christ's love. The last epistle, which, though without a name, tradition and internal evidence ascribe to the apostle of the Gentiles, is that to the Hebrews. Written to Jewish Christians, it has a distinct and peculiar character, answering to its object. None is so rich in the illustration of the types and figures of the law of Moses, and in the contrast of heavenly things with their earthly shadows. But as it needs, for its full explanation, a larger acquaintance with the Old Testament, and a deeper reverence for the Divine wisdom of those ordinances, than has long been usual in the church, it has been especially exposed to misrepresentations, and is much less suited for the present use of Christians, till they have been led into a deeper study of the law, and in general of the Old Testament. These once rooted in the understanding and the heart, this Epistle would resume its true worth and glory; at present, to most Christians, it is a book in truth nearly sealed.

"The Epistle of St. James, on the other hand, directly meets the present state, wants, errors, and evils of the Christian church. It is the great reproof and remedy of worldliness in all its forms. Less deep and abstruse in doctrine, it meets almost every practical corruption which has grown up under the shelter of the Christian name. It is too the especial safe-guard of those whom providence has placed amidst the higher ranks of Christian society. The evils which it at once detects, and provides with a remedy, are those which are most rife in

such society; worldliness and the love of ease (i. 1—12.); false excuses of sin, and claims of merit (ver. 13—18); trifling and vain conversation, passion and pride (verse 19—21); a religion of words and names in contrast with a religion of practical purity and compassion (ver. 22—27); the mock dignity of pride, in contrast with the true royalty and liberty of love (ii. 1—13); the lifeless pretence of faith, opposed to the living reality (ii. 14—26); the offences of the tongue (iii. 1—13); strife and envying (iii. 14; iv. 6); heartless mirth (iv. 7—10); the love of scandal (ver. 11); the desire of gain (iv. 12—17); and as the last consummation of these, the unfeeling covetousness of the last days (v. 1—7). None of the Epistles is of more instant and pressing use to the church at the present time, or gives a more lively view of its varied evils and dangers.

"Of the other Catholic Epistles, those of St. John resemble strongly the Epistle to the Ephesians; those of St. Peter and St. Jude, the Epistles to the Philippians and Thessalonians. The like remarks will therefore, in a great measure, apply. The analogy is particularly strong between the two Epistles of St. Peter, and those to the Thessalonians. In each case the first is simply practical; the second, intended as a supplement and safeguard to the former, is in each a brief summary of Scripture prophecies, especially those of Daniel and St. John. This remark will be of service as confirming the views which may arise upon the second branch of scriptural research."

(*To be continued.*)

POSTSCRIPT ON LAYMEN READING THE LESSONS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I OMITTED to send you a paragraph, though I had written it, in which I replied to the remark of Zenas that "the lay-reading of the Scriptures (in the public worship of the Church) prevailed before the Reformation;" and also to his statement that the rubric says only "he that readeth," and not "the minister;" but Y. F. A. (page 188) has so well observed upon this part of the argument, that I will not trouble your readers with a second communication, except to say that I beg leave to adopt his remarks as a postscript to my own paper. No man who knows any thing of the practice of the Church of Rome will admit the gratuitous and unsupported allegation that unordained persons were allowed, either before or after the Reformation, to officiate in her public services; Zenas should therefore have shewn (which he has not) that the Reformed Church of England has given an authority, or originated a practice, which she certainly did not find already in existence. She does not give permission to any one below the order of deacon publicly to read the Scriptures in Divine worship;—if she does, let Zenas shew where; assuredly not in the rubric which says "he that readeth," which is immediately explained to be "the minister."

How the custom came in, it is not for me to explain; whether from Puritan innovation, or whether from the circumstance that parish clerks and others having, in the days of Popery, been ordained to the order of reader, which is a part of the Romanist "sacrament of orders," the practice was kept up in some places from habit or convenience, after that order was set aside. The Reformation did not forbid the old parish clerks (the very name implies holy orders) to continue to discharge their office, so far as it fell in with the reformed ritual; no question would therefore arise at the moment; and in the course of years, as one and another died off, the new functionary would

take for granted that he was invested with the full office of his predecessor; and some parish clergymen might permit him to read the lessons, as thinking it convenient, and either not adverting to the anomaly, or not being willing to seem to admit, by restricting the new officer from a service which had been allowed to be performed by the old one, that the Romish ordination made any difference. Under nearly similar circumstances grew up the custom of "laymen's reading the Litany in cathedrals," which Bishop Burnet declared to be "indecent," and which is also anti-canonical. Before the Reformation the officiator had been specially ordained to his function; but his successor continued to discharge it as if it were an ordinary part of his general duty. But if such "indecent" customs had been right they would doubtless have been general; whereas they were only very partial; the clergy, in an overwhelming majority of instances, discharging their duty themselves.

I have confined my remarks to the case of parish clerks; because if any other layman read the lessons, he does so only as the locum tenens of that officer, and not of the priest or deacon. I read in books of ecclesiastical law (as, for instance, the "Country Parson's Companion") that "parish clerks were formerly in orders, and their business was to officiate at the altar; and they had a competent maintenance by offerings; but now they are, except in a few cases, laymen, and have, besides wages, certain fees with the parson." It seems to me that the whole confusion arises from giving to the lay clerk (the very phrase is anomalous) what belonged only to the ordained; and if Zenas belongs to the learned profession which his signature implies (Titus iii. 13), I could wish that he would consider this part of the argument. In the mean time, to express Christian brotherhood, though I disagree with him in the question of lay-reading, I have taken a signature from the preceding verse, and am his and your faithful servant,

ARTEMAS.

ON THE BREAD OF *PROTHESIS* (SHEW BREAD) IN THE EUCHARIST.

For the Christian Observer.

In our last Number we touched upon, but did not discuss, the question, What is the "oblation" which in the Church of England service we present to God in the Holy Communion, in addition to "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving?" We fear lest we should weary our readers with too frequent and extensive arguments upon points of this nature; otherwise we should be glad to follow up this inquiry, as it involves some note-worthy matters of ritual antiquity; and also borders upon the question whether in the Eucharist we really make commemoratively a sacrifice of Christ himself to the Father. We may take the liberty of offering a few remarks upon these particulars before long; but for the present we will touch only upon a single statement of Dr. Pusey's, which we have already alluded to in our last Number; namely, that in which he says that the uncanonical and unrubrical side-table, lately introduced by his friends at the Holy Communion, is intended—such are his words—as a substitute for the table of *prothesis*. Who could have expected to

hear of a table of "*prothesis*"—that is, in plain English, of "shew-bread"—in a Protestant church in the nineteenth century? The apostle Paul, in the ninth chapter to the Hebrews, narrates various rites, ceremonies, and articles of the Jewish tabernacle, which were types and shadows of spiritual things, and were for ever done away in Christ; and among these he expressly names, in the second verse, the prothesis of bread. In this passage he does not use the phrase ordinarily employed in the Septuagint; and also in Matthew xii. 4; Mark ii. 26; and Luke vi. 4; namely, the bread or loaves of prothesis, or shewing (*τους αρτους της προθεσεως*), but a phrase which we recollect only once elsewhere, 2 Chronicles xiii. 10: the prothesis or shewing of bread, (*ἡ προθεσις των αρτων*). The word shew-bread, which is used in all these places in our translation, does not express the difference; but it seems to us not unimportant; and we will state why.

In the first place, by using it the apostle seems to have (if we may so speak of an inspired writer) in his mind's eye the passage above alluded to in Chronicles, where we read, "the priests which minister unto the Lord are the sons of Aaron, and the Levites wait upon their business; and they burn unto the Lord every morning and every evening burnt sacrifices and sweet incense; the shew-bread (the prothesis of bread) also they set in order upon the pure table; and the candlestick of gold with the lamps thereof." Now these things the apostle declares were abolished. Contrasting the old covenant with the new, he says,—"Then, verily, the first covenant had also ordinances of Divine service, and a worldly sanctuary; for there was a tabernacle made; the first whereon (rather the interior part of the edifice in which) was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread" (the table and the prothesis of bread) He then describes what was placed "after the second veil," namely, "the golden censor and the ark of the covenant," &c.; and he adds that the first tabernacle "was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices;" and that there were various "carnal ordinances imposed, until the time of reformation;" but that "Christ being come, a high-priest of good things to come," he had abolished these carnal ordinances and the ritual of a ceremonial religion. The whole argument is one of the strongest passages in the Bible against those gorgeous devices by which Popery attempts to imitate, under the Christian dispensation, the superseded emblems of Jewish worship, even to the shew-bread, the incense, and the seven-light candlestick. This system of superstition soon began to work, and parts of it are to be found in the Greek and some other oriental churches, as well as in the Latin; for it was a very early practice to assimilate the observances of Christianity to those of Judaism; and, in spite of St. Paul and his fellow apostles, to revive, under new forms, the abrogated ceremonials of sacerdotal worship.

We think it not unlikely, therefore, that the apostle was led to select this phrase with express reference to these foreseen circumstances; for he takes in the largest range of idea; not merely the specific Jewish shew-bread, but generally "the shewing of bread"—that is, the offering it up before God as a sacred rite, as was done in the temple and tabernacle, and which is imitated in that prothesis which Dr. Pusey vindicates. However, be this as it may, we have St. Paul's declaration, that under the Christian economy prothesis of bread was utterly abolished; while Dr. Pusey maintains that it ought to be revived. Dr. Pusey does not attempt to quote Scripture to aid

his opinion; the only argument that can be urged is, that having been an ancient custom it is apostolical; which being mere assertion, it were sufficient to meet it by asserting, in return, that it was not apostolical; but we have the inferential testimony of Scripture to prove the point, for Scripture says nothing of it.

We do not, however, wish to speak more strongly than the case requires. Devout men and women, in early ages, made oblations of bread and wine, as well as of money; but this is not, of necessity, connected with the subsequent superstitions, which, in many instances, grew out of this and various other observances of ancient simplicity. But our reformers, having witnessed the cluster of unscriptural ceremonials which had grown up around the sacraments in the Church of Rome, brought them back to the standard of the New Testament; and, among other things, discarded the table or bread of prothesis; in which they were well justified by the apostle's argument above cited.

ON THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF EXTEMPORE PREACHING.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I AM glad to find that the attention of your numerous readers has been called to the advantages and disadvantages of extempore preaching. It is a subject of weighty interest to the ministers of Christ, since it involves the important question: "How can I most effectually preach that Gospel, which has been confided to me, that it may not suffer in my hands, but accomplish all its blessed purposes of grace and mercy to my people?"

During four years I officiated in a large hospital, where it was my custom daily to address the patients extempore, which I found to be easy and pleasant to myself; and, I trust, not unprofitable to my hearers. But having been called to a parochial charge, it occurred to me seriously to consider whether, under altered circumstances, *written sermons* would not be preferable to the course which I had hitherto adopted. Not being able quite to satisfy my mind, I mentioned the subject to a dignitary of the Church, whose answer had great weight in deciding me to give the preference to written sermons. It was to this effect: "Can any extempore preacher declare that he *does his best?* Does he not depend upon the impulse of his feelings, at the moment, for the expressions which he uses? Are these always the best suited to impress the matter of his doctrine? Would not the serious and careful preparation of his sermon before, in his private retirement, be a safer and a more excellent way?"

I must not, however, lose sight of your able correspondent A. B., the advocate of a different practice. He seems to decide the question against himself when he allows that "the advantages of extempore preaching are confessedly *in the delivery*;" for surely the delivery is not near so important as the matter, the truth preached, the arrangement of the discourse, and the sound words employed. And if in *written* sermons, as A. B. justly remarks, "the statements will usually be more clear and explicit, the arguments more logical, the reasoning more acute, the division and arrangement of the subject better managed; *more to the purpose will be said in fewer words*, and the language will

be more chaste, elegant, and finished;"—surely the advantage must lie on this side, especially when we consider that extemporaneous addresses are too often painfully defective in all the above particulars.

But here I perceive that A. B. and I are again at issue. His experience and observation differ widely from mine in the estimate which we have formed of extempore preaching. He states, "I do not know a single instance of a clergyman, who preaches extemporaneously, who does not preach good and useful sermons in the truest sense of that expression." Would that I could give an equally favourable account; but too often have I heard, with pain, the ill-expressed, incoherent, rash, and often exaggerated statements of my brethren (in many cases young brethren), who have adopted this practice. It is true their preaching has been admired; their churches have been crowded; the popular taste has been gratified; but would that I could entertain the hope that their sermons were of a nature to promote the glory of God, and the real interests of true religion.

A. B. admits that "there are some ministers who would preach better if they wrote and read their sermons." Most cordially do I assent to this; but I go further, and say, that the great majority of extempore preachers would be more efficient, if they were to write out their sermons; to write them out—not, however, merely to read them, as a student would read his theme, but to preach them with the vigour and earnestness which a zeal for God and for souls demands. And this leads me to observe, that it is a wise and excellent practice to write our sermons expressly with a view to their delivery in the pulpit; to write as we should speak. If we use simple terms, short and easy sentences, pointed and touching appeals (*sermoni propriora*) we shall find, in the pulpit, that we are able to fix the attention of our hearers, and that our manuscript rather aids than impedes us. The effect will, indeed, be similar to that confessedly experienced in the reading-desk, where, from having a preconceived form of prayer, we find our hearts and affections to be more at liberty in ascending to God. Only then let our sermons be written, not as a mere composition, but *with a distinct* view to their practical effect when we preach; and I think that the disadvantages and dangers of extempore preaching will be avoided, and any advantage which it may possess adequately secured.

C. D.

ON THE EXPECTATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL ANTICHRIST.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE observed, with some apprehension, the extent to which what may be called the secular interpretation of prophecy has, of late, been carried. The millennium, the new Jerusalem on earth, the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, the personal reign of Christ, and the doctrine of an individual Antichrist, are urged in so literal a sense, that I fear lest some weak minds should be led into the error of Swedenborg and others, by attaching physical ideas to the most spiritual and celestial representations. I speak with great deference; as many truly pious and devoted Christians, among whom are some well-read and learned persons, go very far into this system of literal interpretation.

But it was solely to the last particular, that of an individual or personal Antichrist, that I wished to invite the attention of your readers, for the sake of quoting a few remarks upon it, from the writings of the venerable Tyndale. I would add them as a supplement to the observations of Mr. Frere in favour of the doctrine, and of G. B. in opposition to it, in your volumes for 1835, pp. 482 and 658; and 1836, p. 16. They occur in the preface to Tyndale's treatise on the "Wicked Mammon."

"Mark this also above all things; that Antichrist is not an outward thing, that is to say, *a man* that should suddenly appear with wonders *as our fathers talked of him*. No, verily; for Antichrist is *a spiritual thing*; and is as much as to say against Christ, that is, one that preacheth false doctrine, contrary to Christ. Antichrist was in the Old Testament, and fought with the prophets; he was also in the time of Christ and the apostles, as thou readest in the Epistles of John, and of Paul to the Corinthians and Galatians, and other Epistles. Antichrist is now, and shall (I doubt not) endure till the world's end. But his nature is (when he is uttered and overcome with the word of God) to go out of the play for a season, and to disguise himself, and then to come in again with a new name and new raiment."

Tyndale goes on to say that the Scribes and Pharisees, in their day, were Antichrist; but that, eminently, popery was Antichrist. "The Jews," he says, "look for Christ, and he is come 1500 years ago, and they are not aware; we also have looked for Antichrist, and he hath reigned as long, and we are not aware." It is remarkable that the discussion lately revived, should have commenced with the æra of the Reformation. I am aware that some persons construe the other particulars above-mentioned literally and personally, who would agree with Tyndale that Antichrist is to be taken figuratively; but, I think with Mr. Frere, that if we adopt one, we must, to be consistent, adopt all.

L. R. G.

QUERIES UPON THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER'S REMARKS ON DR. PUSEY'S LETTER; WITH REMARKS,—AND A REPLY TO DR. VAUGHAN AND THE DISSENTERS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In making up our minds on any points which involve historical facts, we can hardly be too cautious in admitting what may seem to be only assertions. Will you have the kindness, then, in your next Number, if you can find room, to answer (or, rather, explain) the following points?

1. In your last Number (about p. 184) you say that the "side-table" for the offerings of the Eucharistic sacrifice, has been expressly forbidden by the Church of England. I confess that I am in ignorance of this fact, and you would oblige several of your readers by furnishing them with the proof.

2. Again, in p. 186, you say, that the Papists assert a "*bloody* sacrifice" in the Eucharist. Will you have the goodness to inform your readers of your authority for saying this? I assure you that you will be giving very important information to a very large number of persons, even among the clergy, who are in complete ignorance, at present, of this fact.

3. And, in the same page of your Magazine, you urge it as a reason against the notion "that in the Holy Eucharist we are making a commemoration *to God* the Father, of the sacrifice of his Blessed Son,"—that "*God does not need to be put in mind.*" Will you have

the goodness to give your readers some safeguard to this principle thus assumed, so that it may not be applied, by unscrupulous reasoners, even to the subject of prayer in general?—and explain the conformity of your principle with such a text as "Put ME in remembrance; let us plead together?"

4. At p. 173 you teach us, that "kneeling (or consecrating) *before* the altar" was purposely abolished at the Reformation, and the words "Before the people" *introduced to prevent that position.* Will you have the goodness to give some proof of this from history?—(a single reference may suffice)—for several of the clergy of my acquaintance (with myself) had been accustomed to think that the intention of those words in the rubric was simply to prevent any previous and private consecration of the elements (such as the papists have); and is in conformity with the other rubric which directs that *all* the remaining elements shall be construed at the time of the original consecration.

If it were of any consequence you might have my name; but perhaps it is more convenient to answer such points apart from all personal feeling. Or, if you would not object to insert this letter, it might bring some answers from your correspondents. Uniformity is certainly desirable (for example, in such matters as celebrating the Eucharist), and I and others of my brethren are certainly, at present, observing the rubric in the way which you condemn; nay, have *always* been accustomed so to do, before we heard of Oxford Tracts.

A CANTERBURY PRESBYTER.

*** We wish that our correspondent had favoured us with his name; in order that we might be the better assured that he does not mean to write a little satirically, or to entrap us with his queries. It is, however, very satisfactory to us that amidst the numerous statements in our remarks on Dr. Pusey's letter, the Canterbury Presbyter has pointed out but four as needing corroboration. We will touch upon each of them; but to go fully into the questions would require that we should repeat many pages of what we urged—and, we think, conclusively—in former papers, and also add at least as much more of new matter. It is not fair quietly to pass by all our arguments, and to ask questions anew, as if nothing had happened.

I. Our correspondent commences thus: "In your last Number, *about* (!!) page 184, you say that the side-table for the offerings of the Eucharistic sacrifice has been expressly forbidden by the Church of England." We said no such thing, either "about" that page or any other; for, first, we did not use the ambiguous phrase, "the offerings of the Eucharistic sacrifice," upon which any meaning may be put—from "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and the "offering and presenting our souls and bodies," which require neither table of prothesis nor material altar, to the doctrine of transubstantiation itself, which asserts a perpetually renewed actual sacrifice of Christ; and we have to complain that our correspondent uses the phrase in this connexion, because it assumes the very point in question—namely, that the Church of England acknowledges "the offerings of the Eucharistic sacrifice;" so that if we say Yes, we may be made to mean a perpetual commemorative offering of Christ to the Father, which we deny that our Church acknowledges; and if we say No, we may be reproached as not admitting even the truly Eucharistic sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and, of ourselves, soul and body, with all that we possess, as a reasonable service. Our correspondent shapes his inquiry after that unfair manner of cross-examin-

ing, which is not intended so much to elicit a fact as to make the witness appear inconsistent and ridiculous. X deposed that he never wounded Y, and that he had no weapon to wound him with; upon which the cross-examiner asserts that X says he had no weapon when he wounded Y; which makes his story as inconsistent as ours would be, if, denying altars, we had used the sacrificial terms which our correspondent employs in remarking on our statement. We did not say that our Church forbids a side-table for "the offerings of the Eucharistic sacrifice;" for to acknowledge those offerings and sacrifice in the Oxford Tract sense, would be to say that a table of prothesis is indispensable. If our correspondent uses the words as ours, he misquotes us; if as his own, he should tell us what he means by them. Were we to admit the phrase in the Oxford Tract sense (in which he, perhaps, uses it), we must, of course, admit the consequence that a sacrifice requires an altar; a word which the writers of that school constantly use, though the Church of England has pointedly rejected it. If our reformers had considered that in the Eucharist we offer up a commemorative sacrifice to God the Father, they would have used the word "altar," as the papists do. A sacrifice upon a table is not ordinary phraseology. Any jury, of plain men, who came to the question without prejudice, would admit the conclusiveness of this argument alone, even if there were no other.

Then again, secondly, neither did we say "about p. 184," or any where else, that the side-table "has been expressly forbidden by the Church of England." The vague reference "about p. 184" proves that the writer was conscious that he was not accurate in quoting our words. We shewed that our reformers rejected the Oxford Tract sacrificial hypothesis, which is the real matter in question, and not merely a piece of church furniture; we shewed that throughout the whole communion office they speak of "the table;"—THE table—without the slightest allusion to there being two tables; and we added that the canons, in enumerating "things appertaining to churches," even to "the alms-chest" and "the ten commandments and chosen sentences," pointedly exclude this piece of furniture, which the Laud school of divines consider so important as to be worth making a schism about; and we also quoted the ritualist Wheatly as actually complaining that "WE HAVE NO SIDE-TABLES AUTHORIZED BY OUR CHURCH;" and his testimony is the more memorable because he wished for a side-table, and grievously lamented its absence; for the ancient church, he says, "had generally a side-table near the altar;" so that the pretermission by the Church of England was not by chance, but in accordance with the whole spirit of the English ritual; which does not recognize a table of prothesis, just because it does not recognize "an altar." All this, however, and much more to the same effect, the Canterbury Presbyter passes over as silently as though we had never adduced a single argument; and instead of attempting to answer either us or Wheatly—who was too honest not to admit this unwelcome truth;—instead of grappling with our statement that this article of furniture was "rejected" or "excluded"—for those were our words;—he pretends that we said, "about page 184," that it was "expressly forbidden;" which we did not say; and he then triumphantly calls upon us for "proof" of that assertion. We proved by facts, by canons, by rubrics, and by the dolorous lamentations of Wheatly himself, that it was "excluded;" all which our correspondent discreetly passes over, and asks us to prove that it was "expressly forbidden," which we never asserted. It would be absurd to suppose that the Church, in giving directions what articles parishes are to provide, should give a list also of what they are *not* to provide. The negative is included in the positive; they are to provide what the canon declares to "appertain to churches," and shew-bread tables is not among the number. It was enough that the

church "excluded" and "rejected" these appendages; as she did scores of other articles which Popery made use of, and the loss of some of which the Oxford Tract divines bitterly lament. To shew the unfairness of the Canterbury Presbyter's arguments, take a parallel instance. Suppose that we said that chrism and exorcising are "excluded" or "rejected," by our Church from the administration of baptism; would it be honourable to keep out of sight all the arguments by which we proved this deliberate exclusion, and to pretend that we had asserted —with an "about" page so and so—that they are "expressly forbidden;" and to ask us to prove in which part of the Prayer-book we find this prohibition? It is for those who wish to have a table of prothesis to shew us where it is enjoined; to account for its marked omission, as a part of church furniture, in the canons; and for one "table" only being mentioned in the Communion-service, as well as for the word altar being wholly suppressed; and for the consecrated emblems being called only "bread and wine." What a reproach do these Oxford Tract divines cast upon our Right Reverend prelates, who have consecrated hundreds of churches without ever asking if a table of prothesis were provided*.

---

* It may astonish, if it do not edify, some of our readers, to learn how many articles the compilers of our canons must have proscribed, if they had undertaken to "forbid," instead of merely tacitly "excluding." We will transcribe (modernizing the spelling) an inventory of the articles delivered up by the outgoing churchwardens of St. Olive's, Southwark, in 1558, to their successors. If such were the "things appertaining" to a London parish church, and these had accumulated during the short reign of Mary, after the recent purification, —or, as certain divines call it, "spoliation"—of the Reformation, under king Edward, what must have been the "things appertaining" to magnificent cathedrals, in the good old days when men hoped to purchase heaven by mortuary endowments?

Plate.

A cross of silver with Mary and John, weighing four-score and six oz.

Two Communion cups of silver, gilt both within and without, weighing three-score and 13 oz.

A mazer, garnished with a band of silver and gilt, which weighed by estimation 5 oz.

A chalice, weighing 9 oz. 3 qts.

Copes.

A cope of tissue, raised with blue velvet.

A cope of cloth of gold, with red velvet.

A cope of blue velvet, with St. Tolly. [St. Tolly means St. Olive; the final *t* in Saint being run on by ear to the O; and the whole word being corrupted, as was usual before before the art of reading and spelling became general. Hence St. Olive's Street is still called Tooley Street.]

A cope of tawny velvet, with fleurs-de-luce and tongues [for Whitsunday!]

A cope, given by Mr. John Richards, our parson, of cloth of gold, wrought with green velvet, with St. George upon the back.

Vestments.

A suit of vestments of blue tissue and gold, with albs.

A vestment; and a tynacoll of blue cloth of tissue with green crosses, with all the apparel.

Two vestments of green baudkin, with red crosses of satin, with albs.

A suit of vestments which were Mr. Leke's, of red velvet wrought with angels and spread eagles.

A vestment given by Sir Anthony St. Leger, knight, of cloth gold, wrought with red velvet, with the garter and his arms upon the back; with all the apparel thereunto belonging.

A vestment of white baudkin, with a red cross and garters.

Altar Cloths.

Two altar cloths of red cloth of gold, the one for the over part of the altar, and the other for the nether part.

Two altar cloths of blue tissue.

Two altar cloths of red and green, with anchors.

Two altar cloths of white damask wrought with flowers.

Two altar cloths of green baudkin.

An old altar cloth of blue velvet, wrought with stars.

Six altar cloths painted with imagery or pictures.

Fifteen altar cloths of diaper, good and bad.

II. In reference to our correspondent's second question, we repeat that, in the sense which we intended, the Church of Rome does assert a "bloody sacrifice." We were contrasting the bloodless sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and also the incruent commemorative sacrifice which some Protestant divines contend for, with the actual offering up of Christ's body upon the altar of transubstantiation, "with all the constituents of a true body, as *bones* and *sinews*,"—such is the language of the authoritative catechism of the Council of Trent; and to this last we applied the usual epithet descriptive of such sacrifices. We used the word

---

Four plain altar cloths.
More six pieces of old painted cloths.
A plain altar cloth given by Mrs. Awefield.
Two altar cloths of blue and yellow, painted, the over cloth with a crucifix, and the nether with St. Clement and anchors.

Curtains.

Two curtains of white silk.
Two curtains of tawny silk.
Eight pairs curtains, painted, of linen cloth of yellow and red buckram.
Two long curtains of yellow.
Four curtains of red and green silk, given by Mr. Bonyvant.

Books.

Four Antiphonars printed.
A great Antiphonar of parchment.
Four Graduals of parchment.
Four Legends of parchment.
Four Mass-books.
Four Hymnals.
Five Processionaries.
Two Manuals.
Two Psalters, little.
An ordinary book called a Pie.
Four pricksong (music) books, covered with parchment.
A great pricksong book of parchment.

Divers other Ornaments.

A canopy cloth, given by Mr. John Richards, our parson, paned with crimson velvet, perched with gold and black tissue.
A pulpit cloth, given by the said Mr. Richards, paned as aforesaid, with crimson velvet and black tissue.
A cover for the sacrament, given by the said Mr. Richards.
A cloth for the Sacrament, given by the said Mr. Richards, wrought with silk and gold, with four great tassels of gold hanging thereat.
More two sacrament cloths.
Seven diaper towels.
Seventeen albs, some apparelled and some unapparelled.
Ten amices.
Nine little hand towels of diaper.
A towel wrought with silk, given by Mrs. Maryat.
Seventeen surplices, good and bad.
A hearse cloth of cloth of gold, of sundry pieces, raised with red velvet.
Two hearse cloths, one for men, and another for children, sometime St. Clement's.
A cross of copper.
Twelve latten (brass) candlesticks.
A pair of great standards of latten.
Five sacrament bells.
Two bars of iron for the sepulchre.
A little crow of iron.
Two basins of tin, given by Robert Johnson.
Two censers of latten.
A ship of latten (for incense).
A lamp of latten.
A fire shovel.
A chrismatory of tin.
A roller of wood.
Two forms.
A ladder.
Two corporal cases.
A red stole of silk and gold.
A holy-water stock of latten.
A lanthorn.
Two holy-bread baskets.
A veil for the altar.
A cloth for the rood.
Four staves for the canopy.
Four staves with castles for to carry light about the sacrament.
A chest in the vestry with bars of iron, and a bolt of iron with two great hanging locks.
Four other chests belonging to the church.
The lease of Horseydown, with divers other writings, lying in the aforesaid chests.
A banner cloth of green silk for the cross, with the Trinity upon it.
Two flags of silk, with the queen's arms in them.
Six banners of silk.
A streamer of buckram, with St. George upon it.
Nine banner poles.
A crucifix of white silk, given by Mrs. Blanke, and set upon the altar cloth.
Two great cushions stuffed with feathers.

there is benefit is frus- defect of inten- of the officiator.

only for distinction sake, to point out the actual "corporeal immolation" of Christ, contended for by the Church of Rome, as contrasted with a commemorative offering; or with an offering of praise and thanksgiving; or with the presentation of ourselves, soul and body, with all that we have, to God. But even in the strictest sense we consider the word as justly descriptive of the Romanist assertion. Thus stand the facts. Old writers were wont to contrast an alleged incruent sacrifice in the Eucharist, with the cruent sacrifice of the cross. Whether by incruent sacrifice was meant thanksgiving, self-dedication, offerings of property or of the fruits of the earth, or a commemorative sacrifice; none of these included what the Council of Trent means, when it says that Christ is actually "immolated" in his very and true body upon the altar in the Eucharist. But the Church of Rome, with its usual sophistry, in order not to be condemned verbally, though it is in matter, by the writing of the Fathers, retained the word incruent, and actually inserted it in those very articles of its faith which assert a cruent sacrifice; an actual, and not emblematical, pouring out of real blood. However much, therefore, Papists may affect to throw off the epithet which Protestants justly attach to their doctrine, we maintain, that in spite of their professions they do assert a bloody sacrifice in the "immolation" of the altar; and that our correspondent may see that we are not alone in our statement, we will quote two out of innumerable passages which we might adduce from Protestant authors in corroboration of it.

The Rev. J. Mendham, in his valuable Memoirs of the Council of Trent, speaking of the doctrine established in the twenty-second session, says: "If the epithets applied to the sacrifice of the mass, or the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, mean anything, they express a palpable falsehood; for sacrifice in a true and proper sense it is none at all. The very additional epithet *unbloody* is a perfect and decisive demonstration of this; for it is of the essence of a sacrifice that it should be bloody, that it should be made a sacrifice by the loss of blood or of life. If the epithets mean only, or allow to be meant, that the sacrifice is a figurative or improper one simply, this is to say that it is neither a true nor a proper one (which the Council declares it to be); that is, in one word, that the whole parade of conciliar definition is a fallacy or deception." We fully concur in this statement; and as we neither wished to be the dupes of "fallacy or deception," nor to use "lying words" to others, we took the liberty to call things by their right names; and instead of incurring blame from any friend of the Oxford Tract system for so doing, we ought to have been thanked for our candour, in that while we maintained that the Eucharist is *a commemoration of a sacrifice*, and not *a commemorative sacrifice*—as Oxford Tracts teach—we carefully distinguished the latter opinion from the grossness of the papal notion, which asserts a true and actual sacrifice of a real human body, which has "bones and sinews," and the blood of which is literally poured out upon the altar.

We will now quote a passage from the Rev. G. Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," book ii. chap. iv. "In that sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, say the Fathers of the Council of Trent, the self-same Christ is contained and is unbloodily immolated, who once upon the cross offered himself bloodily. Now such language is palpably inconsistent with the doctrine of transubstantiation. If the substance of the wine, as the same Tridentine fathers assure us, be changed, through the prayer of consecration into the substance of Christ's blood; and if in the sacrifice of the mass the self-same Christ be immolated, who offered himself as a piacular oblation upon the altar of the cross; it is clear that the sacrifice of the mass, according to the Latin (church) notions of it, IS NOT AN UNBLOODY SACRIFICE; for by the hypothesis, the wine having been

transubstantiated *into literal material blood*, by the same hypothesis *literal material blood cannot but form a part of the sacrifice.*"

Mr. Faber, we should state, most clearly and learnedly proves that even the doctrine of a commemorative sacrifice was wholly unknown in the apostolic age, and for many years after. He shews that "The ONLY sacrifice and oblation recognized in the Eucharist by the primitive church, were the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the material oblation of the bread and wine upon the Lord's table under the aspect of an offering of the first-fruits of God's creatures, anterior to, and in order to their consecration;" and he challenges the Romanist to produce any evidence "that the Christians of the first ages considered the elements of bread and wine as a sacrifice *after* their consecration." It was not till about the beginning of the fourth century, when primitive simplicity was well-nigh lost, and many vanities and superstitions had intruded, that, in order to find an analogy with the Jewish sacrifices, the Eucharist began to be called "a commemorative sacrifice;" and the epithet "unbloody" was adopted to qualify the word sacrifice. But justly adds Mr. Faber, "When the substance of the bread and wine, was, in defiance of all antiquity, determined to be materially changed into the substance of Christ's body and blood; and when consequently the celebration of the Eucharist was deemed a *literal* sacrifice of the *literal* body and blood of the Saviour, nothing could be more flagrantly absurd than to continue to bestow the epithet of unbloody upon what the innovating transubstantiative decree of the fourth Lateran Council had plainly metamorphosed *into a bloody sacrifice.*" "The old epithet was carelessly (rather artfully) retained, though the reason for its adoption had ceased."

Concurring with Mr. Faber in these statements, we will not be so "flagrantly absurd," as to admit that the Romanist does not assert "a bloody sacrifice," however speciously he may affect to adopt the term unbloody. We are not deterred from avowing this opinion by our correspondent's satirical remark that this "important information" will be news "even among the clergy." We could link a whole catena of Protestant writers who come to the same conclusion. Indeed it was a stron point in the arguments of the Reformers; for, as Bishop Ridley remarked, one of the papists' "subtle shifts" to get rid of the scriptural arguments, especially those in the Epistle to the Hebrews, against the continuance of an order of sacrificing priests under the Christian dispensation, and to ward off the force of the fact that there are but two orders of priesthood mentioned in the word of God, was to use "distinction of bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." They would have been very glad of the charitable aid of our Canterbury correspondent, who tells them that the clergy of the church of England do not consider that, in asserting that they literally and actually "immolate" the body and pour out the blood of Christ upon an altar, they assert a cruent sacrifice, any more than if they offered only "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

But why appeal to Protestant authorities? Open the missal itself, and say if it be possible to express, in stronger terms, the idea of a sanguineous sacrifice than is done throughout that office. We will copy, as a specimen, a few of the long catalogue of rubrics which relate to "defects in the celebration of the mass;" which defects are so numerous, so insidious, and some of them so impossible to be guarded against, that neither priest nor people can ever be sure that there is any real sacrament; indeed on the part of the receiver all the benefit is frustrated, and the sacrament becomes no sacrament, if there be any defect of intention or mistake, or other invalidating circumstance, on the part of the officiator.

As these things ought not to be concealed from the unlearned, we will give the passages in English; and that our translation may not be suspected of being made for the occasion, we will copy from the Rev. T. Kingston's pamphlet, entitled, "Extracts from the Mass-book, with observations," lately published in Dublin. The extracts, besides their immediate purpose, will be found useful, as exhibiting a specimen of the mummery and superstition of a ritual which some among us seem anxious to defend from the justly severe charges which our reformers urged against it. Our readers will discover, in these extracts, Dr. Hook's authority for saying that he should have burned the sacramental wine if there had been a fire, which many Protestants considered his own invention; whereas they will find that he only obeyed the rubrics of the Mass-book. We will not spare the reader the nausea of one or two disgusting passages; but we refuse to copy some others of a more gross kind.

"If a fly, or spider, or something else, have fallen into the chalice before consecration, let him throw the wine into a suitable place, and place other wine in the chalice, let him mix a little water, offer it as above, and continue the mass; if a fly or something of this kind have fallen after consecration, and nausea arise in the priest, let him take it out, and wash it with wine; at the end of the mass, let him burn it, and let the combustion and lotion of this kind be thrown into the the sacrarium. But if he has no nausea, nor fear any danger, let him take it *with the blood.*

"If something poisonous have fallen into the chalice, or calculated to excite sickness of the stomach, the consecrated wine is to be placed in another cup, and other wine with water is to be placed, again to be consecrated. And at the end of the mass, *the blood placed on linen cloth or hemp* is to be preserved so long, until the species of the wine shall have dried up, and then let the hemp be burned, and the combustion be thrown into the sacrarium.

"If, *in taking the blood*, a particle have remained in the chalice, let him draw it with his finger to the lip of the cup, and take it before purification; or pour in wine and take it (the blood).

"If the host, before consecration, be found broken, unless it plainly appear to the people, let such a host be consecrated; but if it can be an offence to the people, let another be taken and offered: but if an oblation had already been made of that host, let him take it after ablution. But if before oblation the host appear broken, let another host be taken, if it can be done without offence for long delay.

"If, on account of cold or carelessness, the consecrated host break into the cup, on that account nothing is to be repeated; but let the priest go on with the mass, by performing the ceremonies, and the customary signs with the remaining part of the host, *which is not wet with the blood*, if he can conveniently. But if it have been all wet, let him not take it out, but say every thing by omitting the signs; and let him take together the body and blood, signing himself with the chalice, saying, 'Corpus et sanguis Domini nostri,' &c.

"If, in winter, *the blood be congealed* in the chalice, let the chalice be wrapped in warmed cloths: if this does not suceeed, let it be placed in hot water near the altar, provided it does not enter into the chalice, until it be melted.

"If through carelessness *some of the blood of Christ have fallen*—if, indeed, on the earth, or on the board, let it be licked with the tongue, and let the place itself be scraped as much as is sufficient, and let what has been scraped off be burned; and let the ashes be laid up in the sacrarium. But if it have fallen on the stone of the altar, let the priest suck up the drop; and let the place be well washed, and the ablution be thrown into the sacrarium. If a drop have come on the linen of the altar, and to the second linen—if even to the third, let the linen coverings be thrice washed, where the drop has fallen, placing the chalice under, and let the water of ablution be thrown into the sacrarium.

"But if it happen that *the whole blood*, after consecration, *is poured out*—if indeed any, even a little, has remained, let it be taken, and regarding the rest of the blood *that has been poured out*, let it be done as has been said. But if none at all has remained, let him place the wine again, and water; and let him consecrate from that place 'Simili modo postquam cœnatum est,' having first, however, made an oblation of the chalice, as above.

"If the priest vomit forth the Eucharist, if the species appear entire, let them

be reverently eaten unless nausea arise—for, in that case, let the consecrated species be carefully separated, and let them be replaced in some sacred place, until they are corrupted; and afterwards let them be thrown into the sacrarium. But if the species do not appear, let the vomit be burned, and the ashes be thrown into the sacrarium."

Is it possible for words to assert more strongly a sanguineous sacrifice? and yet a Canterbury Presbyter gives us to understand that our reverend brethren are astonished at our statement. We will only ask if, "without the shedding of blood, there is no remission;" and if the Romanists say that the mass is a remissionary sacrifice, how can it be bloodless?

III. Under the third head, the Canterbury Presbyter, after misquoting our words, and making us assert what we never asserted—namely, the general proposition, that "God does not need to be put in mind" (which, however, *in one sense*, is true, even if we *had* asserted it), goes on, to ask us to give our readers "some safeguard for the principle thus assumed, so that it may not be applied, by unscrupulous persons, to the subject of prayer in general;" and to reconcile this "principle" with such a text as "Put me in remembrance; let us plead together." With regard to this particular passage (Isaiah xliii. 26), we only hope that the Canterbury Presbyter does not quote Scripture so loosely in his sermons; for so far from its implying (though that would be a Scriptural doctrine, from other texts) that we are by our prayers to put God in mind of his gracious promises, or of the redemption that is in Christ, it is almost, if we may reverently so speak, an ironical appeal, and has no reference whatever to the question under consideration. Mr. Scott, the commentator, paraphrases it: "If Israel could deny this charge, *let them remind God of their good works*, and plead with Him, declaring on what ground they expected to be continued in his special favour, and to be justified before him." Did the passage prove any thing in relation to the question in hand, it would be that in the Eucharist "we remind God of our good works."

But, passing by the inappropriateness of this quotation, we beg leave to say that we laid down no such principle as our correspondent intimates; and we asserted nothing that contravenes the text just quoted, even if it had meant what he implies. What we said was in answer to Mr. Melvill's statement, that "the church, when celebrating the Eucharist, approaches the throne of grace by representing Christ unto his Father in the holy mysteries of his death and passion;" and that the commemoration is not "putting *ourselves* in mind," but "is strictly a commemoration made to God the Father." In reply to this we said: "We do not believe that our heavenly Father needs our representing Christ unto him (in the alleged sacrifice of the altar), to keep Him in mind of the oblation and satisfaction made once-for-all upon Mount Calvary; it is we who need to be kept in mind of it, and to shew Christ's death till he comes again." And why did we not so believe? Simply because we find nothing in Scripture on which to ground the notion that the Eucharist is a sacrifice to God the Father; so that we are not constrained to believe it merely because it was the opinion of many uninspired men; even though among them may be found the venerable Bishop Wilson, whom the Oxford Tracts quote (No. 42) as saying: "We offer unto thee, our king and our God, this bread and this cup." "May I adore thee, O God, by offering to thee the pure and unbloody sacrifice which thou hast ordained by Jesus Christ." "May it please thee, O God, who hast called us to this ministry, to make us worthy to offer to thee this sacrifice for our own sins, and for the sins of the people." If Bishop Wilson here alludes to the prayer in the Communion Service, in which it is said, "And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any

sacrifice;" he entirely perverts it, by turning it into a prayer that the priest may be made worthy to offer to God the body and blood of his Son, for his own sins and the sins of the people; for the prayer is not the prayer of the priest only, but of all the people; and the only sacrifice specified in it is that of "praise and thanksgiving." We may confront with Bishop Wilson, the venerable "bishop and martyr" Latimer, in a passage which is, we observe, very pertinently quoted from his sermons, in a series of highly valuable papers in the "Record;" a publication in which have appeared not a few most able, scriptural, and conclusive papers, upon the deleterious doctrines of the Oxford Tracts. Latimer remarks—not, perhaps, in the best taste, but with sound argument:

"I will not say nay, but that ye shall find in the old doctors this word sacrificium, but there is one general solution for all which St. Augustine showeth us, 'The sign of a thing hath oftentimes the name of the thing that it signifieth.' As the Supper of the Lord is the sacrament of another thing, it is a commemoration of his death, which suffered once for us; and because it is a sign of Christ's offering up, therefore it bears the name thereof. And this sacrifice a woman can offer as well as a man: yea, a poor woman in the belfry hath as good authority to offer up this sacrifice as the bishop in pontificalibus, with his mitre on his head, his rings on his fingers, and sandals on his feet. And whosoever cometh, asking the Father remedy in his necessity for Christ's sake, he offers up as acceptable a sacrifice as any bishop can do. And so to make an end, this must be done with a constant faith and a sure confidence in Christ."

Archbishop Cranmer, as quoted in the same paper, speaks to the same effect. We request our reader's attention, in perusing the extract, to the words which we have marked in capitals. Mr. Melvill had maintained that the Eucharist is a commemorative sacrifice, *not* in the sense of putting ourselves in remembrance of Christ's sacrifice, but of putting the Father in remembrance of it; to which we replied, that it is we who need to be reminded; for God is ever mindful, ever willing, ever gracious; on his part, "reconciliation" if freely proffered; it is man who requires to be exhorted, "Be ye reconciled unto God;" and, when reconciled, to have his faith strengthened by the visible oft-recurring commemoration of his Saviour's death and love. And, accordingly, Cranmer uses almost our very words. He says: "It was ordained by Christ to put US in remembrance of the sacrifice made upon the cross." If we erred, we erred in good society. The following is the passage:

"The adversaries of Christ gather together a great heap of ancient authors, which, as they say, call the mass or Holy Communion a sacrifice. But all those authors be answered unto in this one sentence, that they call it, not a sacrifice for sin, because that it taketh away our sin . . . BUT BECAUSE IT WAS ORDAINED BY CHRIST TO PUT US IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE SACRIFICE MADE UPON THE CROSS. As St. Austin, 'that which men call a sacrifice, is a sign or representation of the true sacrifice. But the humble confession of all penitent hearts, their acknowledging of Christ's benefits, their thanksgiving for the same, their faith and consolation in Christ, their humble submission, and obedience to God's will and commandments, *is a sacrifice of laud and praise*, accepted and allowed of God no less than the sacrifice of the priests. For Almighty God, without respect of persons, accepteth the oblation and sacrifice of priest and lay-person, of King and subject, of master and servant, of man and woman, of young and old; yea, of English, French, Scot, Greek, Latin, Jew, and Gentile; of every man, according to his faithful and obedient heart unto Him, and that through the sacrifice propitiatory of Jesus Christ.'"

"Therefore, when the old Fathers call the mass, or Supper of the Lord, a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of laud and thanksgiving, (and so as well the people as the priests do sacrifice), or else, that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory for sin; but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin.'"—*Cranmer. Fathers of the English Church*, vol. iii. p. 517.

There is, indeed, a Scriptural sense, in which, in the Eucharist, as in prayer and praise and baptism, we "put God in mind;" but this was not the matter

upon which we were remarking. It is ample proof that our words could not be justly cavilled at as they stood, that our anonymous correspondent was obliged to garble them before he remarked upon them. It would, indeed, have required a "safeguard," or something more, if we had said, as he asserts, that "God does not need to be put in mind," when He himself directs us to put him in mind; but it does not follow that he needs "a sacrifice" to be offered perpetually upon earth to remind him that the all-prevailing Mediator sits at his right hand to make intercession for us, clothed in that body which was offered up, once-for-all, upon the altar of Calvary. To speak as though the Father listens to the intercessions of Christ, not because they are ever-present to him, but because we symbolically "represent" them to him; not because "we have an Advocate with the Father," in heaven, but because we sacramentally repeat, from time to time, upon earth, the appointed commemoration of his sacrifice as a sacrifice itself, is not Scriptural phraseology; and we wish, in such questions, to say no more than Scripture warrants, however strongly uninspired writers, whether Fathers, or Romanists, or Oxford Tract Anglicans, may have expressed themselves upon the subject.

If our readers will refer to the Articles of our own Church, which relate to the Lord's Supper (Art. xxv.; also xxviii. to xxxi.), they will see that there is not a syllable that warrants the notions to which we are objecting; and the advocates for which, instead of giving us either Scripture, as Christians, or the documents of the English Church, as Anglican Christians, refer us to what they call the voice of the Catholic Church; but which we utterly deny to be so. It is very remarkable how studiously our formularies avoid every expression that conveys the idea of sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. In the admirable Homily "On the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," which conveys a large exposition of the views of our Church upon the matter, while accumulated phrases are employed in describing its nature, and the benefits which result from it to the faithful, and the glowing language of several of the Fathers is adopted to shew "the fruition and union betwixt true believers and Christ," there is not the slightest reference to its being a sacrifice to God the Father. The only allusion to sacrifice that we recollect, is in the following beautiful paragraph, in which the "once-for-all" (ἐφάπαξ) sacrifice of Calvary is urged, and the perpetual sacrificial figment of Romanism exploded.

"Now it followeth to have with this knowledge, a sure and constant faith; not only that the death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sins, and reconciliation of sins, and reconciliation with God the Father; but also, that he hath made upon his cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee; a perfect cleansing of thy sins; so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, Redeemer, Mediator, Advocate, Intercessor, but Christ only; and that thou mightest say with the Apostle, that he loved thee, and gave himself for thee. For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in his institution; to make Christ thine own; and to apply his merits to thyself. Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing Priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention."

The Reformers of our Church well knew how readily even the change, which some might think slight, of a commemoration of a sacrifice, into a commemorative sacrifice, led the way to some of the worst delusions of popery; for once allow that the Christian minister is a sacrificer, in any sense distinct from that in which every believer is "a priest unto God," and a fatal opening is made for the exercise of unbounded credulity, superstition, pontifical self-importance, and selfish aggrandizement.

We might quote hundreds of pages from protestant authors of all confessions upon these subjects; but we will content ourselves for the present with the

following passages from Du Moulin's "Anatomy of the Mass." We cite from the Rev. R. Shanks' English edition:

"Our alms, prayers, praises, thanksgivings, and in general all worship whatsoever, are called sacrifices in the Holy Scripture. The Holy Supper is, in this sense, likewise called a sacrifice. . . . . The ancient Fathers, endeavouring to allure the Pagans to the Christian Faith, who imagined there could be no religion where there was no sacrifice, and also to conciliate the Jews, whose religion, under the Old Testament, consisted chiefly in sacrifices, called the Holy Supper a sacrifice, the Sacred Table an altar, and those who served at it Levites."

"St. Augustine says, 'The visible sacrifice is a Sacrament—that is to say, a sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice.' And afterwards: 'What men call sacrifice is the *sign* of the true sacrifice.' Observe that he says, 'What men call sacrifice; *admitting that the Holy Scripture does not give it that name.* We have then, in these passages, a clear exposition of that one in which he calls the Eucharist 'the sacrifice of our purchase.'"

"Eusebius, in the Evangelical Demonstration, b. 1. c. 10, says, 'The Lord having offered a sacrifice, and an excellent victim to the Father, for the salvation of us all, ordained us to offer, continually, the *commemoration* of this sacrifice, that we may celebrate it at his table, by the *signs* of his body and blood, according to the institution of the New Testament.'

"In short, the Fathers are full of such passages as these. Moreover, they do not distinguish, in the Eucharist, between Sacrament and Sacrifice; but properly speaking, *there is as much difference between Sacrifice and Sacrament, as between giving and receiving;* for in a Sacrifice we offer to God, but in the Sacrament we receive *from* him. The Fathers do not make this distinction; but they call the Sacrament a Sacrifice, because it is the sign and figure of the sacrifice."

"The Fathers have herein said nothing but what is consonant to the faith. *The error, however, which arose from it a long time afterwards, is a striking example to us that the safest way is to adhere to the language of the Apostles, and not to depart from the style of the Holy Scripture.*"

The truth which we meant to convey in the passage objected to by our correspondent, was that declared in such texts as the following: "Thou hearest me always;" "He hath an unchangeable priesthood;" "He ever liveth to make intercession;" "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." We plead the sacrifice of Christ before the Father, and in that sense may be justly said to remind Him of it; but we do not offer again that sacrifice, either, as the Papists say, actually and meritoriously, or even in the more guarded form in which some Protestant writers have expressed it. The whole drift of the epistle to the Hebrews ought to be well weighed upon this subject. The Apostle, led by the Holy Spirit, as if in anticipation of the efforts which would be made to restore the sacerdotism and sacrifice of a ceremonial religion, investing the Christian pastor with Aaronic functions, and giving him "something to offer," dwells upon the priesthood of Christ in a manner which all Protestants admit to be incompatible with the Romanist notion of continued propitiatory sacrifices upon earth; and which in spirit opposes also those modifications of the sacrificial doctrine which are held by some Protestants, as in the passage above cited from Bishop Wilson. There is an exaggeration, a hardihood of figurative expression, often employed by divines of this school relative to the Holy Communion, which is not sober or scriptural. Thus the devout George Herbert says, in his "Priest to the Temple," "The country parson being to administer the Sacraments is at a stand how or what behaviour to assume for so holy things; especially at the Communion times he is in great confusion, as *being not only to receive God* (!!), *but to break and administer Him.*" (!!) The mournful truth is, that Popery has so distorted ecclesiastical language, that many divines have talked popery without thinking of it.

What then we meant was, in substance, that when our Lord said, "This do

ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me," he did not mean in order to remind God the Father, but to stir up our own minds by way of remembrance; though of course, in one sense, every act of faith is, reverently speaking, reminding God of his promise, and of the finished work of Calvary. We were putting no new construction upon such passages; for here at least we thought ourselves well supported by divines with whom we do not always agree on some other matters. On opening the "Family Commentary" of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, at the passage just quoted, we read from Bishop Atterbury, the friend of Sacheverell, and who drew up his defence, "The Eucharist being instituted for this very end and purpose, to imprint on OUR minds a lively image of *the great sacrifice* of the cross."

IV. Our correspondent's fourth question is, as usual, introduced with a false quotation, so that in replying to it we must reply to an inquiry respecting something we never said. This is not a satisfactory way of conducting theological discussions. Our correspondent writes: "At page 173 you teach us that 'kneeling (or consecration) *before* the altar' was purposely abolished at the Reformation, and the words 'before the people introduced to prevent that position." Now if our readers will turn to that page, they will see that we never said any such thing. We were not so much as alluding to the attitude of kneeling in that page; nor does the word "kneeling" occur anywhere under that head. The phrase "kneeling (or consecration) before the altar," though marked in the manuscript with inverted commas as a quotation from p. 173, is a gratuitous interpolation. We had said indeed elsewhere, on quite another question, that kneeling at the communion rail retroverted from the people, *in the ordinary morning and evening prayer*, is not prescribed by Anglican ordinances; and we also said, at page 173, following Wheatly and other approved ritualists, that "standing" in front of the communion table, instead of at the north side of it, during the consecration of the elements, so that the people cannot discern what is going on, contravenes the rubric, which directs that the priest having stood before the table to arrange the elements, shall consecrate them "before the people;" not with his back to them, and his body placed between them and the table, so as to intercept their sight, as in the popish mass. But we never said one syllable about "kneeling." What can be our correspondent's reason for misquoting us, and then asking us a question grounded upon the misquotation? If his own practice is to kneel while he is consecrating the elements, and he therefore took for granted that we must have written "kneeling," though we did not write so, he again mistakes the intention of the Church, thus committing two errors, the one in kneeling when he should stand, and the other in placing himself "before" the table, when he should place himself where the people can plainly see what he is doing. In regard to the question of "kneeling" at the consecration, it were superfluous to offer any remark upon it, after the well-known and conclusive reply of Wheatly to Dr. Nichol. Wheatly examines the rubrics, and brings out satisfactorily the result as follows: "So that through the whole service he is ordered to kneel but three times: namely, at the general confession, the prayer of address, and at his receiving the elements; which being those places where he least wants a rubric to direct him to kneel (since, if there were no such rubric, a minister would of his own accord kneel down at those times), and yet there being an express direction at each of those places for him to kneel, it is very evident that where the rubric gives no such direction the minister is always to stand."

With regard also to the question whether he is to stand "before" the communion table, or at the north side of it, while consecrating the elements, Wheatly's

argument, which we quoted in our last Number, at the very page referred to by our correspondent, appears to us quite satisfactory; and it was more prudent than candid to pass over all this in silence, as though there was nothing to answer, and to ask us to prove from history that our Church does not mean her ministers to stand with their back to the people while setting apart the Eucharistic elements. We cited the rubric; and we gave also Wheatly's construction of it, not only because he is an eminent ritual authority, but because his ecclesiastical predilections might rather have inclined him to the opposite opinion; but our correspondent, passing by all this, asks us for history. We protest against this extra-judicial reference, of which we have of late heard so much. One young man finds out, from history, that a deacon's stole, with St. Andrew's crosses, was once worn, and forthwith Anglican rubrics are to be broken to gratify his taste for antiquity. So again, when we referred to the Thirty-nine Articles, Mr. Newman's reply was, that they are historically known to be a compromise among parties, so that he and his friends would not say that they had any meaning at all. In like manner, Dr. Pusey makes the simple rubric—"When there is a communion, the priest shall then *place* upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient"—to mean, then shall he sacrificially offer up the bread and wine upon the altar, by saying, "Its meaning, too, is historically known, that it was the intention of the Church, by inserting it, to restore the primitive custom." Thus, instead of taking our services as we find them, and construing the Articles, as the Declaration prefixed to them enjoins, according to "the plain and full meaning thereof," "the literal and grammatical sense," we are to go about to inquire into their history. We are very far, indeed, from saying that history does not often afford most valuable aid in ascertaining the animus of a document; and in the pending questions we have ourselves often appealed to it; but only subordinately; for, after all, as the Bible is what it is, however the Fathers may have interpreted it; so also our Church is what she is in her formularies*, and not what this or that man says she ought historically to be. Mr. Toplady compiled his "Historic Proof," to shew that the opinions of the Reformers were what is called "Calvinistic," and he completely succeeded in his argument; but his Arminian opponents replied that they were not bound by historical facts, but by authoritative documents.

We have said that we do not think it fair, when we adduce text and proof, to have them passed by, and to be asked for history; as though all went for nothing, unless we are prepared to shew that there is a Report extant of the proceedings which occurred in relation to every particular in the Prayer-book, in order to shew what the text *ought* to mean. But though we protest against this extreme application of historical reference,

* The Papists have always tried to draw men aside from the unadulterated word of God to patristical interpretations; and those who follow their example are aiding the cause of popery. We will give an illustration. Professor Keble, in order to shew the importance of traditionary interpretation, says: "For example: how else could we know, with tolerable certainty, that Melchizedec's feast is a type of the blessed Eucharist?"—*Visitation Sermon*, p. 36. Dr. M'Crie, in his Life of John Knox, describes a discussion between the Scotch reformer and the Abbot of Crosraguell, and says, that "for the first confirmation of this (his definition of the mass) he (the Abbot) rested on the oblation of bread and wine by Melchizedec. His argument was, that the Scripture declared Christ to be a priest after the order of Melchizedec: Melchizedec offered bread and wine to God; therefore Christ made oblation of his body and blood in the last Supper." vol. ii. p. 68. The Professor therefore pleads for tradition, because it furnishes an interpretation for which Scripture gives us no authority, but which the Romanist values as a confirmation of his idolatrous doctrine.

we feel confident, that in point of fact the whole history of the Anglican Church is favourable to those views which we have contended for in the questions arising out of the Oxford Tract discussions; and, indeed, in the very particular upon which our correspondent asks for historical fact, we actually gave it; for it is a historical fact that the Roman Catholic priests then, as now, turned their backs to the people during the consecration; "in order," says Wheatly, still adducing fact, "to prevent the people *from* being eye-witnesses of their operation in working their pretended miracle;" and it is a historical fact, as Wheatly justly states, that "Our Church, that pretends to no such miracle, enjoins, we see, the direct contrary to this, by ordering the priest so to order the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread, and take the cup into his hands before the people." It is, we say, a historical fact, of which the rubric is in itself proof, that the Church enjoined that the Anglican minister, instead of the Romanist custom, should so place himself that "he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread *before the people*." If our correspondent thinks that this is best done by turning his back upon them, his hands and actions being concealed by the ample folds of his surplice, we can only say that rubrical directions are written to little purpose. We will only add, that any clergyman who adopts this practice, ought also to adopt the Romanist custom of elevating the consecrated elements; otherwise how are the people to know when he has consecrated them? and we have been informed that some clergymen of the Oxford Tract school actually do so.

With regard to the opinion entertained by our correspondent, as well, he says, as by some other clergymen, that the direction "before the people" was meant only to prevent the priest's celebrating the Eucharist without a congregation—as in the Church of Rome—that is provided for abundantly elsewhere; the whole service is constructed for a congregation, and would be a mockery without one; and there is, moreover, a specific rubric which declares, that even in the exigency of a parish in which there are not "above twenty persons of discretion to receive the Communion, *there shall be no Communion*, except four, or three at the least, communicate with the priest." There could be no consecration without there was already a congregation; we cannot, therefore, imagine that a rubric was introduced, at that stage of the office, vaguely and obscurely to forbid what was already forbidden and prevented. It was however, we doubt not, introduced to prevent what in effect amounts to a private Eucharist, the performing the consecration, not "before," but *turned from*, the congregation.

It is due to our correspondent and to ourselves to remark, both in regard to this practice, and to kneeling at some parts of the Communion-service where we think the rubrics imply standing, and to other discrepancies which occur from variously construing the directions of the Church, that we attach little or no importance to them, unless they are intended to involve some point of doctrine, as in the introduction of "a table of prothesis." We think, indeed, that our correspondent defeats the intention of the Church by standing before the Communion-table, with his back to the people, while offering up the prayer of consecration; and has it never occurred to him to ask himself how it comes to pass that our Church, which has so carefully avoided giving any direction in any of her services for praying towards the East; and, to prevent it, prescribes that the priest should stand at the North end of the table; should happen to have done so (as he mistakingly thinks) at this most critical part of her offices, where, if any where, it was most important to divest her practice of all appearance of Papal superstition? We should have thought that so remarkable an anomaly would have led Canterbury Presbyters to consider whether Wheatly and other

ritualists may not be right and themselves wrong; and if they are fond of history, it would furnish a curious subject for their researches, to inquire what was the cause of this strange discrepancy, if it really exist. We, on our side, need not history, because we have rubrics, which we construe consistently with all the other rubrics in the Prayer-book; but if there be this singularly-marked exception to the whole tenour of our offices and canons, it could not have been resolved upon without much discussion; and our correspondent ought to be able to shew why turning to the East was prescribed, as he thinks it is, in this particular place, where history abundantly proves that our Reformers would least have tolerated it. But though we consider the intention of the Church quite clear, yet if, from a habit continued in Canterbury, as Dr. Pusey says "bowing to the altar" is at Oxford, or from a misinterpretation of the rubric, our correspondent and his friends think it right to pray and break bread with their backs to the congregation, but not meaning thereby to convey any particular shade of doctrinal interpretation or comment, any more than if they stood on the North or South side, we make a wide distinction between this and the Oxford-Tract innovations, the whole spirit of which is to take us farther from Protestantism and nearer to Rome.

We shall be very glad to escape from these jejune questions upon rites and ceremonies; but we believe that it is needful to set forth the principles of the Church of England in these minor points, as well as in those more directly doctrinal; and this not only for the sake of her members, but in order to repel the attacks of Dissenters, who almost invariably level their objections against our Church, not as she is, but as divines of the class alluded to describe her. We will illustrate this remark by an extract from an elaborate work by a Dissenting minister—the Rev. Dr. Vaughan; whose learning and extensive reading ought to have guarded him against such mistakes as we are about to point out, more especially as he fills the chair of the professorship of "Ancient and Modern History, in University College*, London," and cannot, therefore, plead ignorance

* We have to complain of what we must take the liberty to call arrogant assumption, in order that we may not call it a breach of contract, upon the part of the officers of London University College. When that institution was founded, its projectors, instead of modestly calling it a college, gave to it the magnificent title of the "London University;" thus not only elevating it above all the old academical institutions of the metropolis; but also taking possession, by anticipation, of the capital of the world, as a boat's-crew does of an uninhabited or savage island, by touching at some creek, and setting up a flag in token of conquest; and placing all other collegiate institutions which should hereafter be erected, upon the footing of lawless encroachers; for the acknowledged law of academical institutions is, that where there is a "university" in a town, and bearing its name, there cannot, legitimately, be another; the very name is absorbent; and the founders of this institution must have intended to preclude the establishment of any other "London University," by pre-occupying the title without any qualifying epithet; just as if, instead of being a mere voluntary joint-stock club, they had been a legally acknowledged national faculty. The absurdity of this exclusive pretension became so glaring, when it was proposed to found a general London University by royal charter, that the institution which had so called itself, was obliged, very reluctantly, to lower its pretensions, and to be henceforth only "University College, London," in order to distinguish it from King's College, London, and from any other London colleges which may hereafter be founded. Such was the compact; but, in spite of it, the friends of the institution, because they cannot be THE London University, drop the local restriction, and call themselves "University College," thus arrogating to themselves the title of the oldest college in England. When lately we saw advertised "Thoughts on Academical Education, and Degrees in Arts," by "John Hoppus, M.A., Professor of the Philosophy of the Human Mind and Logic in University College," if we had never happened to have

for confounding individual opinions or proceedings with accredited formularies and prescribed practices. His Life of Wickliffe, though tinctured by his ecclesiastical prejudices, is a work of great research and ability; as is also the volume now in our hands, on "The Causes of the Corruption of Christianity," though it is often warped by party bias, as in the passage which we are about to quote. He says, page 401:—

"It would be well if these aberrations in favour of idolatry were with us purely matters of history, or peculiar to countries, if not to times, separated from our own. But while through the greater part of Christendom the office of Christianity would seem to have been to perpetuate the forms of ancient Paganism rather than abolish them; in our own country—in Protestant England, too much of the same effect is observable. How many things are found in the worship of our state church for which no sanction can be adduced from the writers of the New Testament? And whence should these be traced? Whence the images and pictures which cover the walls of our Protestant edifices? Why has the table of the Lord been converted into an altar of sacrifice, and the name of priest been given to the minister who should only have to do with spiritual offerings—the sacrifices

---

heard that Mr. Hoppus is a political dissenter of the radical school, and well known to the readers of the Eclectic Review, we should have supposed him to be a Master of Arts, not of America or Scotland, but of Oxford, and that by University College was meant that college which for so many ages has been thus styled; except, indeed, as we recollected, that in our universities individual colleges have not professorships; and that the title of Mr. Hoppus's appointment does not occur at Oxford or Cambridge. The omission of the designating word "London" cannot be accidental; for on looking at Mr. Hoppus's pamphlet we find that it occurs not once, but constantly. Thus, in the very first page of the preface—after the usual "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord" panegyric upon seminaries of education which reject prayer, and reading the Scriptures, and the total of Christianity, and thus promote what Mr. Hoppus calls "rational civil and religious liberty," free from "Sectarian" bias,—as Dr. Elliotson, the Professor of Medicine, does, upon a large scale of liberality, by teaching materialism, like that of Mr. Laurence, to whose book Lord Chancellor Eldon refused the protection of copy-right, and which involves, so far as we can make out the system, not only the position that man has no soul, and that Christianity is not a revelation from God, even if there be a God to reveal it; a doctrine which some young men educated in "civil and religious liberty" schools of medicine and philosophy disavow;—in the very first page of his work, we were about to say, when we digressed at the mention of "civil and religious liberty" into an illustrative parenthesis, upon its abuses, Mr. Hoppus speaks of "the enlightened and patriotic founders of the London University, now University College." Here Professor Hoppus jumps over the word "London," as if it had been officially rescinded when the name was changed. It is not a mere ellipsis in consideration of the word "London" having just occurred in the old title; for he elsewhere speaks of "University College" where the old title of "London University" is not in juxtaposition. Nor can it be for the convenience of abridgment; for this κατ' ἐξοχήν University College occurs even on the title-page, where the writer gives his own designation. If he should say that he was thinking only of his own institution, which is henceforth to be known as University College the Great, and that he meant no harm to the little concern at Oxford, the obsolete place where Sir William Jones was educated, we can only recommend the *real* "University College" men to be as particular in adding Oxford, as the false "University College" men (for it is not their true title) are negligent in omitting London. The directors are answerable for the omission, because Mr. Hoppus publishes as a professor in in their college; and he is not alone, for R. Kidd, the Chinese professor, has just published an official lecture, "delivered at University College," without ever once adding London; so that the omission is systematic. Usurpation of titles is not commendable, whether in College professors, or in Dr. M'Hale, who tramples on the law in his published letters to Lord John Russell, by calling himself John Tuam; or in the ministers of "dissenting interests" in various towns and cities, who call themselves the ministers of "the church" in that place; thus unchurching the Church of England and its ministers and laity, as if they were not within the bonds of God's covenant.

of righteousness? What is meant by these mitres, and these many coloured vestments; by these white robes, and those chantings of holy writ from the lips of age and boyhood? Why this special homage to the East? this kneeling to partake of the Sacramental bread and wine: and this signing of the cross in baptism? In these things, and in more like these, we have some of the far distant effects of that old and wide-spread Paganism, which in process of time became so mixed with Christianity as to leave to it scarcely any thing either of the spirit or the external forms by which it was once distinguished."

In this passage Dr. Vaughan asks (it is marked as an interrogation, though it would seem to be rather an exclamation) "How many things are found in the worship of our state church for which no sanction can be adduced from the writers of the New Testament?" Now let the reader run through his inventory.

1. "Images and pictures." These form no part of "the worship of our state church;" our Homilies strongly denounce them; there is no mention of such things in our canons as "appertaining to churches;" and when a plan was once proposed to adorn St. Paul's cathedral with paintings, it was officially forbidden. It is true that carved work, and monuments, and stained glass, and altar-pieces, are to be seen; but be they right or wrong, they have nothing to do with "the worship." Some men take so much offence at such things, and others so superstitiously use them, that it is best to be on the abstinent side, even in admitting what is abstractedly unexceptionable, as well as decidedly to reject whatever is unfit (such as mythological figures) or is likely to be misused; but to say that our "worship" is affected, or that we are seduced into "aberrations in favour of idolatry," is mere extravagance of assertion. We remember hearing that a friend of Dr. Vaughan's, at the time of the Apochryphal controversy in the Bible Society, had the curiosity to refer to his pulpit Bible to see if the Apochrypha was in it; and there it was; but though he had turned the volume over backwards and forwards, from the Old to the New Testament, tens of thousands of times during a long course of years, he had never once noticed the intrusion. The Apochrypha was in his pulpit, but not in his "worship;" and thus it is in the case of some church decorations, which, except ostentatiously brought forward, or known to be intended for some special purpose, lie as dormant as Dr. Vaughan's friend's Apochryphal Bible.

2. "The table of the Lord has been converted into an altar of sacrifice." We deny that it has. Let him produce the proof. He may, indeed, read so in the semi-papistical writings of certain divines; but there is nothing in the formularies of "the state church" which supports his charge. He ought to know that the word "altar," which he uses, is not used in the Prayer-book; much less "an altar of sacrifice."

3. "Why is the name of priest given to the minister who should have only to do with spiritual offerings?" So well-read a man as Dr. Vaughan ought not to have asked such a question. The word "priest" is only a contraction for presbyter; as is the old French word *prestre;* and presbyter is the New Testament word for the order of "elder," as distinct from the order of deacon; and accordingly the Church of England employs it (priest) to distinguish the one from the other, using Dr. Vaughan's own word "minister," to include, in common, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. We ask Dr. Vaughan, in return, Why do you say only "minister," which includes deacons, when, if your orders are valid, you ought to say presbyter,—that is, Anglicised, "priest;" for correctly did Milton remark, though applying the remark sarcastically, that "Presbyter is but priest writ large;" and the best lexicographers give us this etymology. There is nothing in the word which necessarily implies sacrificial function; sacerdotalism is its secondary meaning, though, in general usage, it has

come to be chiefly employed in that sense; yet when a clergyman of the church of England wishes to describe himself as a priest, as distinguished from a deacon, he calls himself a presbyter; and if a layman opens Dr. Johnson's dictionary at the word "presbyter," he reads "a priest." Whether it would have been better to have changed a word which popery had caused to be misunderstood, is a fair question for argument; but it would not have been right to change the specific scriptural appellation for the generic, as the Dissenters have done. Besides which, there are duties appropriate to each. Our reformers had their choice of the vernacular contraction "priest;" or the fuller word "presbyter;" or the English "elder;" but whichever they selected, there was a possibility of some mistake or inconvenience. All that we contend for is, that Dr. Vaughan writes most unfairly in pretending that an English clergyman is called a priest because he is a sacrificer, when he ought to know that he is called so, because our reformers employed the New Testament Greek word Anglicised.

4. "What is meant by these mitres:" What indeed? Did Dr. Vaughan ever see English bishops officiating in these appendages? He knows better. The word has remained, and is symbolical in heraldry, and in figure, just as a hundred other words are; but English bishops do not wear mitres. If we spoke of "Dr. Vaughan's historical *chair*," do we literally mean a four-legged implement of furniture?

5. "These many-coloured vestments? These white robes." English clergymen do not wear "many coloured vestments;" they wear only a plain white one or a black one. If they happen to be graduates of universities they may of course wear, as Dr. Vaughan may, the mark of their degree. He has inserted the word "many-coloured," either to make weight, or to round a period, or because if he had said only a black gown and a white surplice, his own congregation might have replied, Why our own ministers ape these black gowns; and the robe-makers say they can never make the sleeves full enough to please them; and as to a white linen gown, what greater harm can there be in it than in a black silk one? This is a very paltry objection to come from a chair of history.

6. "These chantings of holy writ from the lips of age and boyhood." And do dissenters object to singing the praises of God? Let the apostle James answer this objection: "Is any merry let him sing psalms;" or St. Paul, "in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs" (twice urged Eph. v. 19, and Col. iii. 16); and as to the persons, let David reply, "Both young men and maidens, old men (*lips of old age*) and children" (*boyhood*). As to their singing "Holy Writ,' which appears to be the gravamen of the offence, we should like to know why "Holy Writ" may be sung when put into rhyme by Dr. Watts, and not when without rhyme, and "pointed to be said or *sung* in churches." Or is it the tune that is in fault, so that a plain sustained note is profanation, while Helmsley and Hephzibah are sanctity; that the Gregorian chant is "pagan," while there is nothing but Divine association in the tune of "Drink to me only with thine eyes,' or "Tell me, babbling echo, why," or twenty other reclaimed song-tunes, which are sung every Sunday by "age and boyhood," by "young men and maidens" in dissenting congregations. If the singing or chanting, or call it what you will, either in cathedral or conventicle, is not so conducted as "to make melody in the heart to the Lord," or if the church choristers, or the meeting-house clerk and the leaders of the singing, do not "sing with grace in their hearts to the Lord," there is cause for grief and blame; but this has nothing to do with the principle. The Quaker objects as decidedly to the singing at —— (we do not know the name of Dr. Vaughan's chapel)—as to that in a parish church, and with equal reason; for rhyme or no rhyme, sustained notes or rapid ones, make no difference in the principle. But the great offence is singing "holy writ." And Dr. Vaughan

declares that "it is in these things, and in more like these, that we have some of the far-distant effects" of "wide-spread paganism." A relic of paganism for old men and boyhood to sing the Psalms of David!

7. "Why this special homage to the East?" Our "state church" no where enjoins any such homage, either in her "worship," or in any way whatever; so that she is not guilty of this alleged "aberration in favour of idolatry."

8. "This kneeling to partake of the bread and wine, and this signing of the cross in baptism." Dr. Vaughan needed not to have asked the why of these, since he would find reasons, which men as wise and holy as himself have thought amply to justify them; but it is some novelty to be told that kneeling, while partaking of the emblems of our Saviour's dying love, and "signing with the sign of the cross in token of not being ashamed of the faith of Christ crucified," are "aberrations in favour of (pagan) idolatry."

We have done. We adduce these flimsy "arguments" of Dr. Vaughan's only to shew the need of letting the Church speak for itself; and not allowing those anti-protestant interpretations and practices which expose it to the attacks of Dissenters, as well as minister to much evil within its pale.

ON LAYMEN READING THE LESSONS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE letter of "Artemas" is that of a Christian and a gentleman. Would that all differences of opinion were always thus stated! I will not call this a controversy, for happily the subject is of too little importance either way to assume such a shape. There is indeed little for which to contend; for if I were desirous, on the one hand, that the unworking laity should render assistance to the laborious and often overworked clergy—where, as I still think, they legitimately may—neither did I pretend to adduce any direct or positive law for lay reading; nor will Artemas, on his part, even if he could shew that I had only usage and common sense on my side, attempt to argue, that in the absence of all positive law in his favour, the view he has taken of the inexpediency of the practice can be the only correct one. He did not, I am sure, assume his *nom de guerre* in order to beg the question at issue, by suggesting that his arguments were, as his Scriptural signature imports, so "sound" and "orthodox," as to determine the point without appeal. The fact, after all, I suppose to be, that *prescription* is the only real law on the subject which has been defined to be "usage whereof the memory of man is not to the contrary;" and this usage does not, in this case, merely run back to the period of the Reformation, but is lost in remote antiquity. Now, such a prescription certainly carries with it some degree of authority; especially when long acquiesced in by the Bishops, and even sanctioned by the head of the Church himself, as I have before suggested. I also continue to think, that had the practice been either considered improper or irregular, it would surely not have been observed in most, if not all, cathedrals for whole ages under successive bishops; neither should we have witnessed, as at that of Christ's Church in Oxford, a Dr. of Physic reading the Lessons in his surplice and hood; not to add the precedent of all college chapels for all time; and as "omne major continet in se minus," it is strange if what has been thus done

in the greater could not have been done in the less—that is, in parish churches.

I do not deny that in the Church of Rome, and in the primitive church, from the third century, the Readers were ordained persons, and formed a part of the inferior clergy—that is, one of those four orders which Cardinal Bona himself regards as only of ecclesiastical institution. Tertullian is the first writer who speaks of it as a standing *order* in the church; so honourable however was it considered, that persons of the highest dignity were ordained to it; since it appears, from Sozomen, that both Julian and his brother Gallus were Αναγνωστες. They are however mentioned in the two first centuries; for Justin Martyr speaks of them in his Apology; and it is probable that the early Christian Church followed the example of the Jewish Church in this respect, and adopted the custom of the Synagogue as its model, wherein it appears they had Readers of the law and the prophets, who were merely laymen; for Dr. Lightfoot, who was deeply versed in Jewish rites and ceremonies, tells us that on a Sabbath day seven persons read in order—first a Priest, then a Levite, then five Israelites, one after another; and if neither a Priest nor Levite were present, then seven Israelites performed that service. This accounts for our blessed Saviour's reading the lesson in the synagogue at Nazareth —most probably the lesson for the day, out of the Prophets—for we know that He was neither a Priest nor a Levite. It is likely he had done so before, whilst he lived amongst them as a private person, and so took his turn with the other members of the Synagogue there; for though none but learned men and in orders as we may say, might *preach* and *teach*, yet even boys and servants might *read* there, if they could read well. The delivering the book to him by the minister of the congregation, or "Angelus Ecclesiæ" as he was called, and Christ's delivering it to him again, as was the regular custom, shews that he stood up, or was called up to read, as a member of the Synagogue, in the ordinary way. Upon that particular occasion indeed he took upon him afterwards to expound in his character of Prophet, which he then began to assume, and which gave him a right to do so, according to their usage. It is likely, then, that from this custom among the Jews was derived and continued the practice of laymen reading the Scriptures in the public service without any particular appointment by ordination thereto. Perhaps in the third century, when we first read of ordained "Lectors," it might be found expedient to set apart certain persons, by imposition of hands, to that office; as by delivering a Bible to them it gives them authority to read it in the public congregation, in order to prevent the performance of it by improper persons. Still, at Alexandria even the Catechumens were permitted to read in the churches; and Cyprian speaks only of Readers being commissioned or deputed by the Bishop to such a station in the church.

It appears then, upon the whole, that no Canon or Rubric can be produced directly *authorizing* the lay reading of the lessons, though the latter may be thought, by some expressions that have been alleged, to *allow* of it, as of a custom that had long prevailed, and was established by prescription; whilst our judicious Reformers would admit of no merely *ecclesiastical* orders, restraining them solely to such as were instituted by Christ and his Apostles; they still, however, left the practice of

reading the Sacred Scriptures in the church (as it seems to have prevailed in the earliest ages) to the sanction of the Bishop, or to the discretion of the principal minister in the congregation, as had been the practice in the Synagogue.

I was unwilling to say less than I have now done, leaving the argument for the expediency of the practice to rest upon the reasons I before adduced.

These I think are not sufficiently estimated by "Artemas," who appears mainly to deprecate the assumption of the clerical office and dignity. I hope that I can also feel this part of the question in some degree as I ought; and perhaps it is because I do so, that I have thought the subject deserving of all consideration; nor do I apprehend much or any evil from its public discussion. "Let every thing be done decently and in order;" but "let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind" as to the application of that scriptural canon to our present rubrical difficulty; and especially I entreat the attention of those in authority to this subject. In the mean time, and until something shall be authoritatively settled, "Artemas" and myself must be content to differ, unless he should be disposed to admit that I have at least as good ecclesiastical authority on my side as himself, and that the practice for which I contend is at all events anything but a modern innovation.

ZENAS.

POETRY.

HYMNS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

[FROM "Hymns of the Primitive Church," collected, translated, and arranged, by the Rev. J. Chandler: a work containing many beautiful specimens of ancient devotional metrical composition before the Papal apostacy, with others of later date; extracted from the baser matter of the Parisian Breviary, and old books of Latin hymns. The translation is executed with chaste poetical feeling. We copy two hymns for the present season, and one of a general character.]

FOR GOOD FRIDAY.

(*Prome vocem, mens, canoram.*)

Now, my soul, thy voice upraising,
Sing aloud in mournful strain
Of the sorrows most amazing
And the agonizing pain
Which our Saviour
Sinless bore, for sinners slain.

He, the ruthless scourge enduring,
Ransom for our sins to pay,
Sinners by his own stripes curing,
Raising those who wounded lay,
Bore our sorrows,
And removed our pains away.

He to liberty restored us
By the very bonds he bare,
And his nail-pierced limbs afford us
Each a stream of mercy rare;
Us they fasten
To the cross, and keep us there.

When his painful life was ended,
Then the spear transfixed his side,
Blood and water thence descended,
Pouring forth a double tide:
This to cleanse us,
That to heal us, is applied.

Jesu! may thy promised blessing
Comfort to our souls afford;
May we now thy love possessing,
And at length our full reward,
Ever praise Thee,
As our ever-glorious Lord.

LENT.

(*Solemne nos jejunii.*)

THE solemn season calls us now
A holy fast to keep:
And see within the temple how
Both priest and people weep.

But come not thou with tears alone;
Or outward form of prayer:
But let it in thy heart be known
That penitence is there.

Thy breast to beat, thy clothes to rend,
God asketh not of thee:
Thy stubborn soul he bids thee bend
In true humility.

Oh! let us then, with heart-felt grief,
Draw near unto our God,
And pray to Him to grant relief
And stay the uplifted rod.

Oh! righteous Judge, if thou wilt deign
To grant us all we need,
We pray for time to turn again,
And grace to turn indeed.

Blest Three in One! with grief sincere,
To Thee we humbly pray,
That fruits of mercy may appear
To bless this fasting-day.

DEDICATION OF A CHURCH.

(*Urbs Jerusalem beata.*)

O CITY of our God,
Jerusalem the blest!
Thou glorious abode
Of holy joy and rest!
To sing thy praise
The angels throng
In joyful song,
Their voices raise.

Thou comest from the sky
In robes of royal pride,
Thy husband the Most High,
And thou his chosen bride.
All shining bright
With purest gold,
Thy streets unfold
A glorious sight.

Thy holy gates are decked
With pearls of beauty rare,
And none but God's elect
Can be admitted there;
Who undergo
Sorrow and shame,
For Jesus' name,
On earth below.

Thy living stones are they,
By renovating grace,
Prepared for Christ to lay
In their appointed place:
There they will stay,
Honoured and loved,
Ne'er to be moved
From thence away.

Praise to the God of heaven,
Praise to his only Son,
And praise to him be given
Who joined them both in one:
The holy Dove
Who makes them meet
For the blest seat
Of God above.

THE BAY OF POZZUOLI.

[From the "Solace of Song, being short Poems suggested by Scenes visited on a Continental Tour;" a volume which combines a devout and tender spirit with poetical eloquence. There is no name to it; but it is attributed to the pen of a clergyman—the Rev. J. A. Latrobe, the Editor of the late Mr. Gipps's Sermons, and the author of "Chenaniah," and "the Music of the Church," a work containing much valuable and interesting information upon this delightful portion of sacred worship. Another member of this pious and gifted family—the Rev. Peter Latrobe—has just ushered into the world, with an appropriate preface, the most complete Memoir which has appeared in the English language of the saint-like Moravian bishop, Count Zinzendorf, being an abridged translation from the German of Bishop Spangenberg by Mr. Jackson, who has favoured the world with several other devout and interesting productions of the German press. The "Solace of Song" is beautifully printed, and illustrated with admirably-executed woodcuts.]

" *The south-wind blew, and we came to Puteoli.*"—Acts xxviii. 13.

FAIR sea! whose lines of rolling wave
Flash back the gladsome day,
And seem, as the broad beach they lave,
In murmurs soft to say,
'Is there a wanderer on my breast?
I 'll bear him gently to his rest,
And sooth his cares away;
Here, where sweet flowers of thousand hues,
The welcome of their balm diffuse.'

Not thus—not thus thine accents broke
On Paul's awakened ear,
When hoarse thy boiling waters spoke,
And mocked the seaman's fear!
Thrice rose the sun, yet flung his light
Idly upon that triple night,
Wrought by thy wrestlings dread;
Whilst on thy fickle breast of foam,
Man found nor refuge nor a home!

Rude sea! hadst thou no sealed charge,
That fearful crew to spare,
To mark, when sank the fragile barge,
Thy Lord's beloved there?
Yea, though thou foam above, below,
Thy bounds are set—thus far may'st go,
Farther thou may'st not dare:
In vain thy billows course their way—
Saved are the souls! Disgorge thy prey!

And yet, methinks, when Paul once more
Sought thy rude waves to greet,
The rippling waters coursed the shore,
To kiss his sainted feet—
But he nor trusted thee nor feared;
Not at thy pleasure safe he steered,
Or 'gainst thy scowlings beat:
He knew Jehovah ruled, as slaves,
Thy myriad host of wanton waves.

He *blamed* thee not—when from thy breast
Thou heavedst him on the sand;
Bound to obey his Lord's behest,
He kissed his Master's hand:
He *blessed* thee not—when soft thy smile
Beam'd bright on Malta's rock-girt isle,
And wooed him from her strand,
With murmur soft, and calm blue eye,
Once more thy heaving gulfs to try.

He *blessed* thee not, when swift the prow
Shot hither like a dart,
When now stretched Rhegium, and now
Puteoli's ocean-mart—
He knew the gentle hand that led
And smoothed thee like a mother's bed
Unstable as thou art,
And placed the sands to bound the tide,
A curb upon thy crested pride!

The hand that scooped thy waste of waves,
Had stilled their angry roar,
And, day by day, o'er yawning graves,
Guided his ocean-car:

And the same hand would shield him still
From every snare, from every ill;
Till, led by Bethlehem's star,
He gained, with an expanded sail,
Where wrecking storms no more prevail.

Oh for a faith! the faith of Paul,
To rise above things seen;
To cease to feel and mourn that all
Are not as might have been:
That ocean, air, the land, the fire,
Might aye celestial thoughts inspire,
And from earth's pleasures wean—
Then all I think, or hear, or see,
Were token from my God to me.

And thou, fair sea!—for be thy form,
As spread before my sight,
Or heaved and frothed abroad by storm,
Or gemmed by twinklings bright—
I love thee for thy Master's sake,
And hail the thoughts thy waves awake,
Thoughts clothed in mystic might,
That He, who rules in Heaven above,
Loves me, his child,—for *He* is Love.

One hour upon this lonely shore,
Where Paul before me trod,
Hath lent me wings in hope to soar,
And commune with my God.
Oh would this fresh'ning southern breeze,
That murmurs gently through the trees,
And spreads their scents abroad,
Bear hither, as my longings rise,
The loaded gales of Paradise!

What is life's course, by day and night,
But an unstable sea,
Now wrestling in malicious might,
Now frothed in sportive glee?
Why should I heed its restless wiles,
Its heavenly wrath, or twinkling smiles,
Its frown or revelry?
I heed nor blame—it has its hour—
The tool of an Almighty power!

O give me grace, my gracious King,
To take, as from thine hand,
The woes its boisterous tempests bring,
The comforts of its strand—
Then every breeze shall echo, 'Come,'
And every billow waft me home,
To Canaan's blissful land,
Where rolling thunders cease to roar,
And the tossed Soul rests evermore!

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FABER ON THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

(Concluded from page 127.)

We have continued the review of Mr. Faber's work, in order to keep prominently before ourselves and our readers the paramount question under discussion; namely, the Scriptural and Protestant

doctrine of justification by faith. Most of the ritual matters which have lately engaged our attention, are important chiefly as they are connected, directly or remotely, with this fundamental doctrine of Holy Writ; which truly is "most wholesome, and very full of comfort." Popery subverted it by mixing up sanctification with justification; and then it perverted sanctification, by substituting in its place "bodily exercises," which are but one of its effects; and hence justification by faith came to be resolved into justification by baptism; and a second justification was to be achieved mainly by an *opus operatum* efficacy of the Eucharist and meritorious works; and as the two sacraments of Christ's appointment were not enough to complete this double justification in the case of sin after baptism, there was another sacrament invented—the sacrament of penitence; the whole system being eked out by a burdensome anti-evangelical routine of rites and ceremonies, either to keep inviolate the first justification, or to promote the second; or to work out, though doubtfully, what we might call the third. Thus the true sacraments were perverted, and false ones were invented; and the whole system was so contrived, that, theoretically, "the Church," but, practically, the priest, intervened on every occasion between Christ and the human soul.

The doctrine of justification involved long and zealous discussions in the Tridentine Council. A few of the members expressed themselves in terms very nearly scriptural; maintaining that justification is a forensic term as opposed to condemnation; and that it is freely bestowed only for the merits of Christ, through faith; but the great majority maintained and decreed, that to justify is not to declare a person righteous, but to make him so; and that though there is prevenient grace, works lead the way to justification; and the Council anathematises those who say that works do not co-operate with faith in order to justification. We see no substantial difference between the doctrine of Trent and the doctrines of Mr. Knox and the Oxford Tracts; for Trent acknowledges as much as they do, that men are not justified "without the meritorious righteousness of Christ;" and it even declares that, in adult persons, "the commencement (*exordium*) of justification is from the prevenient grace of God in Christ, without any merit on their part" (*nullis eorum existentibus meritis*); but it makes baptism the instrument; and it sets aside the Scriptural doctrine by teaching that we justify ourselves, only God being our helper. Before the decisions of this council, members of the Church of Rome might hold, and some few did, purer doctrines than those which they are now bound under anathemas to believe, and which had long been the actual system of popery, though some parts of it were not till then so definitely settled. The decrees and canons of Trent were intended to enact, by statute, what had long been the common law of Romanism; but, at the same time, to state various disputed doctrines so artfully as to guard them as much as possible against the attacks of Protestants armed with Holy Writ; and the result is, as in the case of the Oxford Tracts, that, by qualifications and blending scriptural truths with false inferences, error is often made to appear so plausible that it is not easy to attack it; just because it wriggles from the grasp with jesuitical lubricity. The more wary of the Romanist writers have imitated this example; some of them do not deny even the doctrine of justification by faith. Oh no!

they do not contradict the Apostle Paul—that is, in words; but they explain away the doctrine till they contradict his meaning. Thus the Rhemish Testament, in a note on Galatians iii. 27, says: "When justification is attributed to faith, without mention of good works, or other Christian virtues or sacraments, it is not meant to exclude any of the same from the working of justice or salvation; for here we learn that by the sacrament of baptism also we put on Christ, which is to put on faith, hope, charity, and all Christian justice." Yes, blessed be God, in putting on Christ we put on a new nature, which delights in all Christian virtues; but these virtues are not the precursors of justification; and so far from "putting on" faith "by the sacrifice of baptism," faith is required as a prerequisite to baptism; and as justification accompanies faith, there may be justification—and, in the case of adults, there ought always to be, as in the case of infants there is promised stipulation—before baptism. The Rhemish annotator adds: "The adversary's evasion, that it is faith which worketh in the sacrament and not the sacrament itself, is plainly false; baptism giving grace and faith itself to the infant that had none before." This is one way of overleaping difficulties.

The Oxford Tract writers no more verbally deny the doctrine of justification by faith, than do the more astute Romanists; but they altogether explain away its scriptural and Protestant meaning; and then, having thus given a wrong view of the doctrine, having changed the living child for the dead, they say, True, the Church of England admits the doctrine of justification by faith; who denies or doubts this? You will find it asserted in the Article; we all believe it; but why make all this stir about such a trifle? for, practically speaking, whatever may be the abstract point of theology, the doctrine is obsolete; justification being bestowed in baptism, and baptism now taking place in infancy, so that in point of fact there never was a time in our memory in which we were not justified, though we may have been living all our lives in profligacy and infidelity. In this they copy the example of the Papists. Bishop Gardiner of Winchester, in his well-known letter preserved in Fox, says, that as persons are now generally baptized, and therefore justified, in infancy, and consequently never did any works in an unjustified state, the doctrine of justification by faith, as asserted by Protestants, even if it were true, is of no greater practical importance than to discuss whether, when the infant Saviour sat in the lap of the Virgin Mary, "he weighed heavier if a flea chanced to settle on him." In like manner, one of the Oxford Tracts teaches in regard to the thirteenth Article, "On works before justification," that "to us individually who have been born within it, [the church], and who were never left to our mere natural powers, having had original sin remitted to us through baptism in our infancy, and having then been justified and cleansed from all sin, and had the grace of Christ given, and fresh supplies pledged to us, the statement of the character of works done before justification and the grace of Christ does not apply.....it does not speak of a state in which we ever actually were." We readily admit that if the Church of England meant no more by justification by faith than the Oxford Tract divines include under the expression, there has been a great deal too much said about its being the articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ, and so forth. They substitute, as we said, the dead child for the living, and then say that there has been far too much contention about—

a corpse. And herein consists much of the insidious poison of the Oxford Tracts. Formerly the objectors to the doctrine of justification by faith only, boldly avowed that it is not maintained by the Church of England. The Oxford Tract writers are too wise for this; they cannot get over the Eleventh Article as some of their predecessors endeavoured to do; but they coolly say that it was doubtless "innocently intended" (!!) though unhappily it has been the cause of infinite mischief, having led to "the wildest Antinomian doctrine." Thus, by verbally admitting, but slighting, perverting, or disparaging, the great doctrines in which Protestants differ from Popery; extenuating those in which Popery differs from Protestantism; and magnifying, with unscriptural exaggeration, various points of "mint, anise, and cummin;" they alter the whole system of Christianity as it appears in the Protestant confessions of faith: and whitewash Romanism, so that neither its friends nor its enemies would scarcely know it under its renovated appearance. The invocation of saints is too notorious to be denied; and Protestants account it idolatrous; the Oxford Tracts only quietly say, as though it were a matter of very slight importance, "It is safest not to pay them this extraordinary honour." The Council of Trent declares that departed saints are to be supplicated, and even their images to "receive due honour and veneration;" but its decree "possibly admits of an honest interpretation." Thus are the delusions of Rome palliated. And then, on the other side, Anglican doctrine is palliated also. The Thirteenth Article is doubtless very good and Scriptural in its way, but it is not of the slightest practical moment; and the Eleventh was "innocently intended," though unhappily it has led to great licentiousness. But if a minor matter of "bodily exercise" is to be urged, there is none of this nonchalance; Professor Pusey lauds an old lady who abstained from snuff in Lent. The divinely-revealed doctrine of justification by faith is of no practical importance; but to padlock a snuff-box during a fast prescribed by the Church, is saint-like piety. It is by these distortions, even more than by direct mistatements, that the Oxford publications work so much evil. First they break down the barriers of Popery; next they break down the barriers of Protestantism; and then they find a delightful via media on no-man's-land—certainly not on Scriptural ground. We might cite hundreds of pages in proof of our remarks, but we will content ourselves with a single extract from Mr. Newman's sermons. It will be most fair to give one long consecutive passage; on which, however, we must refrain from commenting, as there is scarcely a sentence in it which does not call for remark; so that if we began we could not speedily end. Our readers cannot fail to remark the quiet, off-hand, parenthetical manner, in which Mr. Newman admits important doctrines, but passes them by as matters of little moment; the gross unfairness of his representation of evangelical truth; and the insidious manner in which he sets aside spirituality in religion, the religion of the heart, and communion with God, by urging upon his reader "the ecclesiastical expression" of them, rather than the inward experience of them. The slighting remarks upon "the work of Christ" and "the atonement and sanctification," are peculiarly exceptionable; but, in truth, the whole passage is so. The statement, that what is popularly called "evangelical doctrine" leads to latitudinarian indifference respecting the doctrines of the Gospel, even as

to whether Christ is God or not, is worthy of the uncharitableness and mendacity of Popery itself. He says:

"Instead of looking off to Jesus, and thinking little of ourselves, it is at present thought necessary, among the mixed multitude of religionists, to examine the heart, with a view of ascertaining whether it is in a spiritual state or no. A spiritual frame of mind is considered to be one in which the heinousness of sin is perceived, our utter worthlessness, the impossibility of our saving ourselves, the necessity of some Saviour, the sufficiency of our Lord Jesus Christ to be that Saviour, the unbounded riches of his love, the excellence and glory of his work of Atonement, the freeness and fulness of his grace, the high privilege of communion with him in prayer, and the desirableness of walking with him in all holy and loving obedience: all of them solemn truths, too solemn to be lightly mentioned, but our hearty reception of which is scarcely ascertainable by a direct inspection of our feelings. Moreover, if one doctrine must be selected above the rest, as containing the essence of the truths which (according to this system) are thus vividly understood by the spiritual Christian, it is that of the necessity of renouncing our own righteousness for the righteousness provided by our Lord and Saviour; which is considered, not as an elementary and simple principle (as it really is) but as rarely and hardly acknowledged by any man, especially repugnant to a certain (so called) pride of heart, which is supposed to run through the whole race of Adam, and to lead every man instinctively to insist, even before God, on the proper merit of his good deeds; so that, to trust in Christ is not merely the work of the Holy Spirit (as all good in our souls is), but is the especial and critical event which marks a man as issuing from darkness, and sealed unto the privileges and inheritance of the sons of God. In other words, the doctrine of justification by faith is accounted to be the one cardinal point of the Gospel; and it is vain to admit it readily as a clear Scriptural truth (which it is), and to attempt to go on unto perfection; the very wish to pass forward is interpreted into a wish to pass over it, and the test of believing it at all, is in fact to insist upon no doctrine but it. And this peculiar mode of inculcating that great doctrine of the Gospel, is a proof, (if that were wanting,) that the persons who adopt it are not solicitous even about it on its own score merely, considered as (what is called,) a dogma, but as ascertaining and securing (as they hope) a certain state of heart. For not content with the simple admission of it on the part of another, they proceed to divide faith into its kinds, living and dead, and to urge against him, that the truth may be held in a carnal and unrenewed mind, and that men may speak without real feelings and convictions. Thus it is clear they do not contend for the doctrine of the justification as a truth external to the mind, or article of faith, any more than for the doctrine of the Trinity. On the other hand, since they use this same language about dead and living faith, however exemplary the life and conduct be of the individual under their review, they as plainly shew that the fruits of righteousness are in their system no evidence of spiritual-mindedness, but that a something is to be sought for in the frame of mind itself. All this is not stated at present by way of objection, but in order to settle accurately what they mean to maintain. So now we have the two views of doctrine clearly before us:—the ancient and universal teaching of the Church, insisting on the objects and fruits of faith, and considering the spiritual character of that faith itself sufficiently secured, if these are as they should be; and the method, now in esteem, attempting instead to secure directly and primarily that 'mind of the Spirit,' which may savingly receive the truths, and fulfil the obedience, of the Gospel. That such a spiritual temper is indispensable, is agreed on all hands. The simple question is, whether it is formed by the Holy Spirit immediately acting upon our minds, or, on the other hand, by our own particular acts, (whether of faith or obedience,) prompted, guided, and prospered by Him: whether it is ascertainable otherwise than by its fruits; whether such frames of mind as *are* directly ascertainable, and profess to be spiritual, are not in reality a delusion, a mere excitement, capricious feeling, fanatic fancy, and the like. So much then by way of explanation.

"1. Now, in the first place, this modern system certainly does disparage the revealed doctrines of the Gospel, however its more moderate advocates may shrink from admitting it. Considering a certain state of heart to be the main thing to be aimed at, they avowedly make the truth as it is in Jesus, the definite creed of the church, second in their teaching and profession. They will defend themselves indeed from the appearance of undervaluing it, by maintaining that the existence of right religious affections is a security for sound views

of doctrine. And this is abstractedly true; but not true in the use they make of it: for they unhappily conceive that they can ascertain in each other the presence of these affections, and when they find men possessed of them (as they conceive), yet not altogether orthodox in their belief, then they relax a little, and argue that an admission of (what they call) the strict and technical niceties of doctrine, whether about the consubstantiality of the Son, or the Hypostatic Union, is scarcely part of the definition of a spiritual believer. In order to support this position, they lay it down as self-evident, that the main purpose of revealed doctrine is to affect the heart—that that which does not seem to affect it, does not affect; that what does not affect it, is unnecessary; and that the circumstance that this or that person's heart seems rightly affected, is a sufficient warrant that such articles as he may happen to reject may be universally rejected, or at least are only accidentally important. Such principles, when once become familiar to the mind, induce a certain disproportionate attention to the doctrines connected with the work of Christ, in comparison with those which relate to His person, from their more immediately interesting and exciting character, and carry on the more speculative and philosophical class to view the atonement and sanctification as the essence of the Gospel, and to advocate them in the place of those of 'heavenly things' altogether, which they have already assailed, as regards the ecclesiastical expression of them; and of which they now openly complain as mysteries for bondsmen, not Gospel consolations. The last and most miserable stage of this false wisdom, is to deny that in matters of doctrine *there is* any one sense of Scripture such, that it is true, and all others false; to make the Gospel of truth (so far) a revelation of words, and a dead letter; to consider that the Holy Spirit speaks merely of Divine operations, not of persons; and that that is truth to each, which each man thinks to be true, so that one man may say that Christ is God, another deny His pre-existence, yet each have received the truth according to the peculiar constitution of his own mind, the Scripture doctrine having no real independent substantive meaning. Thus the system under consideration tends, legitimately, to obliterate the great objects brought to light in the Gospel, and to darken what I called yesterday the eye of faith; to throw us back into the vagueness of heathenism, when men only felt after the Divine presence; and thus to frustrate the design of Christ's incarnation, so far as it is a manifestation of the unseen Creator.

"2. On the other hand, the necessity of obedience in order to salvation does not suffer less from the upholders of the modern system than the articles of the creed. They argue, and truly, that if faith is living, works must follow; but mistaking a following *in order of succession*, for a following *in order of time*, they conclude that faith ever comes first, and works afterwards; and, therefore, that faith must first be secured, and that, by some means in which works have no share. Thus, instead of viewing works as the concomitant development and evidence, and instrumental cause of faith, they lay all the stress upon the direct creation, in their minds, of faith and spiritual-mindedness, which they consider to consist in certain emotions and desires, because they can form, abstractedly, no better or truer notion of those qualities."

To unweave the intricacies and clear up the ambiguities of this passage were no easy task. It is not a plain, frank, straight-forward exposition. Mr. Newman would, of course, deny that it means justification by works; but we are sure that it does not convey the idea of justification freely by grace through faith; indeed he expressly maintains that "works are the instrumental cause of faith." One chief cause of the unsoundness of this school of theologists is, that they deny, as to any practical consequences, the doctrine of human guilt and corruption. Thus Mr. Newman says: "Such is the blessedness of the innocent—that is, of those who have never given way to evil, or formed themselves to habits of sin; who, in consequence, literally do not know its power or its misery." What human being is there who "literally does not know the power" of sin? "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And what a hypocrite must such an immaculate person be to join in the humbling confessions of the Church of England. Such confessions are utterly unfit for "innocent" people. Is not

this to deny, at least practically, the fallen condition of mankind? We say practically, for we know the usual subterfuge. We do not deny, say these divines, that man's nature is, as you describe it, "very far gone from original righteousness;" but then they argue that baptism reverses this; and as in a Christian land persons are generally baptized in infancy, and then acquire what Mr. Newman calls a sort of angelic nature, so that, as Bishop Jebb and all this school assert, with the Papists, they are perfectly capable of never once, in their whole life, committing a sin—that is, a mortal sin —the doctrine of man's original sinfulness becomes practically set aside, just in the same manner as they set aside the Anglican Article on works done before justification. It might be very right, if preaching to the children of Quakers or Anabaptists, to speak of what man became by the fall—of his corruption, and guilt, and misery; but in the case of persons baptized in infancy, these statements, even though abstractedly true, are quite irrelevant, as much so as the doctrine of the new birth, putting on Christ, and becoming new creatures. In short, as Mr. Newman teaches, those who urge the doctrine of justification by faith are under the influence of "capricious feeling" and "fanatic fancy;" and the principles which they advocate "are *antichristian*; for they destroy all positive doctrine, all ordinances, all good works; they foster pride, invite hypocrisy, discourage the weak, and deceive most fatally, while they profess to be the especial antidotes to self-deception." If this be so, what is gained by Mr. Newman's admitting parenthetically this or that doctrine contended for in some sense of his own, but not the Protestant sense? These plausible admissions only lead to ambiguity; for when the questions come really to be opened, the two parties mean quite different things. Rome knows this, and Protestants know it; and both justly refuse the expedient of a deceptive via media.

But it is time that we should take up Mr. Faber's volume, and dismiss it; and in doing so we ought to observe that the author, far from considering the authority of the Fathers as trivial, attaches to it very great, we might say essential, importance; so that his argument derives additional weight from his predilections. When Mr. Hornby challenged him to disprove, if he could, Mr. Knox's opinion that the ancient church believed that justification means vivification, and that being justified by faith means being sanctified by faith, he was appealing to one, who, so far from being inclined to slight the force of alleged Catholic tradition, verges rather to the extreme of paying too great deference to it. He considers, that those who hesitate to place implicit reliance upon the primitive Fathers, as the only medium by which we may interpret Scripture, are only appealing to their own human judgment. Now, though there may be much self-conceit, as he justly remarks, upon this, as upon other topics, yet we do not see that because a man is willing to take his knowledge of the Christian religion simply from the Bible, using every aid within his reach for its correct interpretation, he is appealing to, or relying on, his own judgment. Is he not rather confiding in the word of God himself,—under the promised guidance and teaching of his Holy Spirit? There is a high degree of respect due to the early Fathers, by reason of their approximation to the Apostolic times; and further, because happily, as might be expected, they breathe the sentiments of Scripture upon the infinitely

important point of justification; but may not our suffrages rather be awarded them as witnesses and depositories, than as interpreters of the truth? Does not an implicit appeal to human authority seem to argue a defect in the Bible—which was given as a rule of faith, containing all things necessary for salvation, able to make wise thereto, and so profitable, that by it the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto all good works? Would it not be a defect, if in all matters of faith and precept it were not its own interpreter? How could it be said, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err in the path to heaven, if we must necessarily have recourse to a human interpreter, so liable in weakness of judgment or pride of intellect to lead him astray? It is said, for our encouragement and repose, that all scripture is given by inspiration of God. Was it likely that that which was expressly written by Infinite Wisdom, to prevent error, should be a sort of Cabbala, impenetrable, save to the initiated? If so, what then becomes of simple men? The Bible, as Bishop Horsley well remarks, is sufficiently plain to the humble inquirer; and perhaps with respect to its being in verity the word of God, its internal evidence is not exceeded by its external, overwhelming and cumulative as that is; and surely nothing but pride, prejudice, or the love of sin, hinders any man from discerning the important truths written upon its pages. There are difficulties indeed, but where principally? In the apparent obscurity of prophetic passages, which nothing but the event can interpret; but the literal fulfilment of many of which has demonstrated that there was no obscurity at all, time only being required to make all bright. So also in those places which are a link between what is revealed and what is not—as the unity of three persons in the Godhead, the incarnation and atonement, the facts of which are revealed, but the mode not—the one belonging to us and our children as objects of faith, the other to the Lord our God. These mysteries are as incomprehensible to the learned as to the unlearned; but their reception involves no real difficulty to a humble unspeculative mind. Other seeming discrepancies have been in every thing important reconciled,—the Bible being its own interpreter; and comparatively modern criticism rather than ancient has been principally instrumental in this.

We have said that we deem the ancients witnesses of the reception and integrity of the Bible. The writings of the three apostolic Fathers, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, are not so much interpretations of Scripture, as quotations, allusions, and practical illustrations. They are most valuable, as denoting the simple faith with which those holy men received the engrafted word of God; but few sober-minded persons would be disposed to take Ignatius as a guide, for rushing upon martyrdom, so contrary to the directions of our Lord, and the example of St. Paul. We do not then see how any man of sober judgment and spiritual desires, can be accused of arrogancy for opening his eyes, and seeing in the Bible the mind of the Spirit, and particularly the doctrine of justification by faith only, written as with a sunbeam. Mr. Faber himself remarks that it is surprising how any one can mistake it. Here then the simple-minded man finds sufficient to make him truly wise unto salvation, even though the ancient doctors had been *all* perverted; which, blessed be God, they were not. Upon Mr. Faber's own shew-

ing, though all the Fathers, save the first three, had been opposed to the doctrine which he elucidates, this would not alter *his* view of it. But why not go farther still? for if these three men (one of them, perhaps, the companion of St. Paul, mentioned Phil. iv. 3) had been among those who perverted the apostle's doctrine even during his life; had been deserters, like Demas, Alexander, or Hymenæus; or had acted like the Judaizing converts; should the Scriptures then be interpreted according to their views, though so diametrically opposed to them? Surely not; and Mr. Faber is not the man to throw the Bible aside, even if it were thus opposed even to the earliest writers. His rejection of Augustine's mode of reconciling the Apostles Paul and James, and his establishment of his own, upon the simple language of Scripture, shews that he does not think the voice of antiquity necessary to sound interpretation. And why may not Tertullian's principle be applied to the Bible itself, as the beginning and foundation of all religious doctrine? In our remarks upon the oft-repeated censure of private interpretation, we do not mean to countenance those visionaries, or partisans, who seize upon detached passages, disregarding the context, and the analogy of faith, or the mind of the Spirit expressed in the word as a whole, in order to support crude or perverted notions; but the censure seems to oppose itself to that plain direction, "Search the Scriptures;" to the directions to Timothy, and the churches of Ephesus and Laodicæa; to the promises of God to those who seek him; and to the commendations bestowed upon those who did so study and search, as in the case of Timothy and the Beræans. St. Peter's declaration, 2 Pet. i. 20, is brought forward to interdict private interpretation; but Bishop Horsley has forcibly argued that the meaning is, No Scripture is to be self-interpreted, but to be compared with other passages; but even according to the usual rendering, the text and context shew that it is of the interpretation of prophecy that the Apostle speaks. There is a wide difference between the interpretation of a doctrine or precept, which in fact need no interpretation, though they require often to be appealed to, to clear them from false interpretations—and of a prophecy which nothing but the fulfilment can explain; but to which attention should be given, as events fall out, for the confirmation of faith. We are not prepared to have the Bible put under lock and key, to be doled out to us only by mere human authority, which after all is only the private interpretation of individuals; or to be covered with a veil which no hand can be permitted to withdraw but that of the ancient Fathers. We repeat, that we are ready to pay great respect to them as good men, and witnesses of the Apostolic integrity of the Bible, and we rejoice, that they were so sound in its vital doctrines, that Mr. Faber can confidently appeal to them; but Scripture is now, as it was then, able, in the hand of the Holy Spirit, to build up spiritual members in the household of faith, some of whom know little beyond its pages, and yet prove by their lives and deaths, that it is the power of God in which their faith stands, and not in the wisdom of men; it is now, as then, a light that shineth in a dark place; finally it is the glass, the only faithful mirror in which we see, though darkly (yet as distinctly as can be in this world) the things that belong to our peace—the glory that shall be revealed.

We have thus exchanged a word with Mr. Faber, thinking that while shewing that the old Fathers,

and especially the oldest, espoused the doctrine of justification by faith, he has somewhat overstated the importance of their concurrence; but the value of his citations is not thereby diminished. Yet, in truth, the cream of his book is not his reply to Mr. Knox from the Fathers, but from Sacred Writ. Those devout men wrote popularly, and did not generally use those discriminating expressions which the progress of errors afterwards rendered more usual among sound divines, especially since the Reformation; besides which, being accustomed to witness chiefly the case of adult converts in ages when the Church was purified by persecution, they almost inseparably blended in ordinary discourse signs with the things signified; baptism with regeneration, and the fruits of faith with its justifying character. Their views, therefore, even when substantially correct, are not always lucidly exhibited; and they fall far short of the clearness of the inspired Epistles of St. Paul. To these—though not to the exclusion of other parts of Holy Writ—the theological student should diligently repair, in his examination of the momentous question, How shall a man be just with God? and Mr. Faber will afford him much useful aid in his inquiry. We do not offer a sample of quotations, because the arguments hang together, and because most of them have been frequently urged in our pages. The writings of the Reformers and other great protestant divines may be profitably consulted on the question; for though the Oxford writers talk of a via media, Mr. Faber shews clearly that it is the old question between Protestantism and Popery. He justly says that the system of Mr. Knox, and of the Church of Rome, are "strictly identical;" and he adds: "I cannot but deem the views of Mr. Knox, in regard to the doctrine of justification, highly dangerous and essentially unscriptural."

WORKS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION.

1. *National Education: a Sermon preached at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, in compliance with the Queen's Letter on behalf of the National Society.* By CHARLES JAMES, Lord Bishop of London.
2. *Religious Education; a Sermon preached after reading the Queen's Letter.* By HENRY MELVILL, B.D.
3. *Central Society of Education (first publication).*
4. *Schools for the Industrious Classes; published under the superintendance of the Central Society of Education.*
5. *What may this System of National Education be?* By the Rev. R. BURGESS, B.D., Rector of Upper Chelsea.
6. *Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Education in England and Wales; with Minutes of Evidence.*

WE repeat our oft-expressed conviction that plans and measures—we had almost said conspiracies—are in progress for making this Christian country nationally infidel; and which, if not promptly met and counteracted by the friends of religion of every name, will issue in the most fearful consequences. It is impossible to read the speeches and mark the actions of many of our public men, or to take up the current literature of the day, without being convinced that, besides much avowed, there is still more secret, infidelity at

work in almost every department of social intercourse. Its operations are occasionally seen in some violent outbreak; but for the most part they are disguised. The concealed sceptic does not attack Christianity, but passes it by as a sort of nuisance; inveighs against its alleged abuses; and endeavours to pre-occupy the ground which it claims in the affairs of nations and individuals, by institutions which do not recognize it, upon the plea that men cannot agree about religion, and must therefore be content to do without it in their social compacts. Even things lawful and useful are thus made to minister to the disparagement of our holy religion. It is excluded from books of what is called "Useful Knowledge;" it is not admitted into literary and scientific societies; and whole Encyclopedias are written upon the tacit understanding that God has never spoken to mankind, and that there is no soul, no heaven, no hell, no eternity. But the infidel would have little success if he did not avail himself of the aid of many who are far from adopting his sentiments. His chief strength has of late been derived from the anomalous working of political questions, by means of which such watch-words as civil and religious liberty have been made to minister to his objects. He wishes to obliterate Christianity, as a system of fable, and a direful cause of strife. I cannot agree with you in this, says the Romanist; but I will be your ally in putting down Protestantism in Ireland. Nor can I agree with you, says the Protestant Dissenter; but I will aid you, on general grounds, in subverting all national religious institutions; I will coalesce with you in a plan for forming universities from which the Bible shall be proscribed; and I am quite of your opinion that public education ought not to be fettered by creeds and catechisms. The infidel has thus a wide field for his exertions; he has neutralized not a few hostile votes; he is sure of the suffrages of those whom he can influence with a deceptive sound of religious liberty; and even the Papist may be thus influenced as long as the name of liberty can be of any use in promoting the ascendancy of his own tyrannical church.

Sure we are, under these circumstances, that the proposals for a system of national education essentially of an infidel character, ought not to be overlooked, as a matter of slight moment, by any person who really believes that the Gospel is a revelation from God. Churchmen and Dissenters ought, on this question, to agree, at least so far as this, that neither will aid the schemes of the infidel; whose object is to prove that, as five hundred sects can never unite, the only remedy is to get rid of that which is instrumentally the cause of their disagreement, and nationally to educate the people in heathenism; leaving Christianity to be supplied, or not, as may happen, from extrinsic sources.

We are glad to see that the evangelical Dissenters have strenuously opposed this anti-religious scheme, by pleading for the unrestricted use of the Bible in national schools. But the infidel replies that the Bible itself is a sectarian book; that he does not credit it; that the Jew rejects the New Testament; and that among those who admit the whole, the Roman Catholic does not approve of its use in schools, and least of all in a Protestant version; and that it is as contrary to religious liberty to make a Unitarian pay school-rates to teach the authorised version, as to pay church-rates to support an Established Church. The churchman also argues, and we think correctly,

that you cannot have a really neutral system; that the master of a school, if he be not an infidel, must belong to some religious body; and that as creeds and catechisms must be virtually embodied, even when professedly renounced, the proper course is to connect popular education with the national church. If that church is not Scriptural; or if every national ecclesiastical establishment is forbidden by the word of God; then proceed to abolish it; but while it is legislatively recognised, it ought to have the superintendence of the instruction of children as well as of adults.

The infidel party are strengthening their cause by these divisions. They first ask, 'Ought not a nation to provide for public education?' To this we have no hesitation in replying, generally, in the affirmative; though subject to the limitations and exceptions which surround all such questions; for a nation is not *so* bound to provide education that it must make the attempt, coercively, unjustly, or at the risk of doing far more harm than good. Then come two other questions, 'Is education, at present, sufficient in quantity, and is it satisfactory in quality?' The Central Education Society has collected a mass of statistical details to prove that it is neither. There is much that is untenable in its statements; for the average of education in Church of England schools, and also in the British Schools, is far better than the members of this society admit; and much that they consider evil is positively good. Thus they complain that writing, arithmetic, and other branches of science, are not taught in Sunday-schools; and they present a caricature instead of a correct description of the religious instruction usually afforded in them. They complain of Bible readings and questions; and as for psalm and hymn singing, it is much too dull and grave for children, who ought to be taught, they say, pretty little lively songs, such as "Little Bo-Peep has lost her sheep," and the like. (See the Central Society's first publication, page 313). And as the quality of the education afforded is falsely described, and a mass of idle gossip is retailed to bring it into contempt, so also its quantity is underrated, at least as to its elastic power; for the potentiality is far greater than the present attainment: the National Society alone, with moderate aid from Parliament, could, through the instrumentality of the clergy in every parish, soon provide as many schools as are necessary. Still, we answer both the above questions, as the Society wishes us, in the negative. There is not enough of education, and what there is requires to be improved. Nay, we will go farther; and admit that a national board, as in the case of the Poor Law commission, could simplify, and cheapen, and improve the whole system, and render it much more efficient; and we will add that we entertain very strong objections to the eleemosynary character of much of the education at present bestowed, by which children are early accustomed to incipient pauperism. In short, we will go very far indeed with the Central Society in its preliminaries; but there we stop; for we cannot admit its conclusion that "something must be done" till we learn what that something is. Better do nothing than do mischief.

Give us schools, say the Central Society, without the Bible. That were about the worst mischief that could happen to the nation; and we purpose shewing, in some future paper (we have not space at present), the fearful

extent to which this ungodly measure has been pressed, especially in the evidence before the House of Commons. Give us schools, say others, which admit the Bible; but without creeds, prayers, or catechisms. This is Lord Brougham's plan; but it could not work; Churchmen and Dissenters, Papists and Protestants, Jews, infidels, and heretics, could not possibly coalesce; each school would be under the influence of the strongest or most active party in a parish, while all would have to pay the expences, though the minority could not conscientiously enjoy its advantages. Nor would the schools long be unsectarian; for the overwhelming influence of the commissioners would soon fashion them all after some one model. This might not, and would not, be the model which the members of the Church of England approve; and yet they would be compelled either to avail themselves of the commission-ruled schools, or to keep up others at their private expence. We need scarcely add, that the whole system is a virtual breaking down of the principle of a National Church establishment. The clergyman of the parish would have no more influence in the regulation of the proposed schools for his infant charge than the dissenting minister; and he would see his flock grow up estranged from his pastoral superintendence; unless he could contrive (which generally speaking would be impossible) some general plan for bringing them together for efficient religious instruction in other ways.

The proposed system would be compulsory. Rates must be paid by those who disapprove of the plan; and as the public school would soon ruin most others, parents in many places would have no where else to send their children. And besides this indirect compulsion, the promoters of the plan talk of introducing Prussian tactics. It is in vain to say they do not. We open the very first paper in the Society's publications, written by Mr. Duppa, the Secretary, and there we read:

"For improvements to be generally and simultaneously adopted, so that the whole of the next generation should have the full advantage of them, they must be enforced, and this by the state. There are, no doubt, evils attending this; as, for instance, the great powers which would be given to government; but if the government be responsible, can its power be too great? It is the execution of the will of the nation; should it not be efficient?"—First publication, p. 21.

Is not this compulsion? Yes, and tyranny. If the education commission should plan "improvements"—such as rejecting the Bible, and teaching chemistry and geography on Sunday, conscientious parents must be coerced into obedience. Mr. Duppa thinks that the power of a government cannot be too great in executing that most tyrannical of all despotisms, the will of a popular body. He alludes, a few lines after, to the schools in Prussia; of which, in another paper in the same volume, we read:

"The children are *compelled*, by the law, to go to school between the age of five and six years; and to remain until the completion of the fourteenth year."

The very next paper in the volume, by Mr. Wyse, the chairman of the committee, vindicates the right to use compulsion. Mr. Wyse says:

"If compulsion is not to be used, it is *only* because compulsion is not in all cases the best means of obtaining the end. It is just to use it, on the principles professed, and acted on, by all shades of German governments; but in other countries, under other modifications, it may not be expedient." "Change the national mind; make it other than it is; re-educate it; make it capable of bearing your law. It is not the laws that should bend to men; but men

should be gradually brought to bend to the law. It was on these considerations that the two leading points of the Scotch system were founded. Schools were erected in every parish; and what was at first compulsion soon became habit." p. 33.

The case of Scotland, in which parochial schools were founded under circumstances very different from those of the present age, is by no means apposite; but if we are to adopt the precedent, let us have the benefit of it by connecting the schools with the national church, as was the case in Scotland.

But it is time that we should cease speaking ourselves, to listen to others; we will, therefore, give a few citations from some of the publications in our hands.

(*To be continued.*)

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.*

THE second reading of Mr. Plumptre's Lord's-day Bill was carried by the large majority of 139 to 68. The measure does not take in all the violations of the Sabbath embraced in Sir A. Agnew's Bill; but it recognizes the general principle of "the holy keeping of the Lord's-day," and it provides for the suppression of one enormous species of violation—namely, trading; forbidding "any manner of labour, or any work in the way of trade or business;" excepting only, besides works of piety, charity, and necessity, the selling of milk and medicines; furnishing liquor, food, and drink, in hotels, inns, cook-shops, beer-houses, and the like, to travellers who are *bona fide* lodging there; and generally the sale of malt-liquor during certain hours. The only ground upon which we can admit that any exception is allowable is, that it can be proved to be pious, necessary, or charitable. In matters that are not, we could not conscientiously make any specification of particular hours, since God has commanded us to keep holy the whole DAY. General exceptions for works of charity, piety, and necessity, must extend to *all* parts of the day; they are not confined to church-hours; and works not included under those heads, are not to be legislatively allowed at *any* hour. The distinction of church hours breaks down the broad principle; and there is but one view in which it can be legitimately recognized—namely, not in order to permit to be done out of church hours what it is unlawful to do on *any* part of the Sabbath—as, for instance, ordinary buying and selling; but, for some purpose consistent with Scripture, to limit to church-hours what, in itself, would be lawful on any portion of the day. For instance, in every family there are many services which may and ought to be performed on the Sabbath; and yet it may be lawful to lay down a family law, that they shall not be done in those hours which would interfere with public worship. If our readers will forgive minute details, we might say that lighting fires, attending children, requisite food, the decent arrangement of rooms and couches, feeding cattle, and various other services, are not incompatible with the sanctity of the Sabbath; and yet several of these things, though necessary to be done at some parts of the day, are to be avoided, where possible, in the hours which ought to be employed in the public service of God; otherwise we break the day by an act which, though not in itself unlawful, is unlawful as to time or circumstance. And here, if any where, the Christian legislator may possibly carry out the distinction in theory, though we think there are very few cases in which it will be safe or requisite in practice. Suppose, for instance, that he is told that selling milk is necessary on the Sabbath; if he think otherwise, he cannot lawfully allow it to be sold before nine o'clock in the morning any more than after; but if he should be convinced that it is necessary, he may, on the general ground of good order, restrict the hour; just as a religious farmer would not allow his servants to be milking cattle when they should be going to church. There are some things which are necessary to be done, which are not necessary to be done all day long; and here, without any sacrifice of principle, particular hours may be lawfully specified. But in applying the principle to legislative measures, there is the greatest possible danger that works not necessary or charitable at *any* time of the day will be included; just as magistrates now very frequently allow ordinary buying and selling before

morning church-hours, without any just plea of duty. If the traffic was either unnecessary altogether, or could be performed the day before, the restriction of hours does not, in the slightest degree, lessen the violation. A man breaks God's laws all the day long who deliberately intends to do it once. The question, therefore, may be resolved into these two: Is a work necessary or charitable at all? And, if it be, is it so all the day long? It is necessary or charitable for a physician to attend a sick man; but if the case is not pressing for an hour, it is not justifiable that he should do it in church time; but a hospital must be kept open, and nurses attend the sick, and requisite medicines be prepared, without restriction to hours. If there are any necessary works which may be restricted within certain hours, we should not break down the principle by enumerating them, and pointing out the hours which will least disturb the sacred repose of the day. And here comes the practical discussion; for worldly-minded men will pretend that many things are necessary which are not so, though they may agree to meet the point of convenience as to hours. As one case in many, we would not voluntarily include the sale of beer on the Lord's-day among works of charity or necessity; but if it can be proved to be so, there is nothing sinful in asking that even things necessary or charitable may be done decently and in order. What we wish to see firmly established is, that we *may not do* unnecessary things out of church hours any more than in them; for this is the real point at issue in the whole question of Sunday-travelling, Sunday-trading, and every other Sabbath desecration.

Mr. Plumptre's bill ought to be warmly supported by petitions, and also by private addresses to individual members; otherwise it will assuredly fail, notwithstanding its moderate character. There is a settled determination, deep and dogged rather than avowed, on the part of not a few members of the House of Commons, to curtail, instead of enlarging, Sabbath protection; and the infidel, the sceptic, and the profane man, cloke their ungodly designs under the well-sounding phrases of public convenience, civil and religious liberty, the rights of private conscience, "cannot make men righteous by Act of Parliament," and the like. We will illustrate our assertion by two facts. Many railway proprietors and directors are conscientiously anxious not to carry on their business on Sunday: Mr. Sturge and others have lately exerted themselves to prevent this overwhelming desecration on the Birmingham rail-road, though we lament to say that they have been outvoted. At a late meeting of the Southampton railroad proprietors, the subject being mentioned, the chairman, Mr. Easthope, M.P. for Leicester, said that he is on the House of Commons railway committee, and that so strong is the feeling of the House in favour of Sunday rail-road travelling, that he had reason to hope that a Bill will pass this session to render nugatory all bye-laws of railroad proprietors to the contrary. Thus, when Satan makes men his slaves, they try to reduce others to the same bondage. We cannot believe that so tyrannical a law will be allowed to be perpetrated; but it behoves the friends of religion, and morals, aye, and of "civil and religious liberty," to be on the watch against such stratagems.

The second illustration to which we alluded, is in the case of the Notting-Hill Hippodrome Bill. We earnestly hope that the Bill itself will be rejected; for most flagitious would it be to authorize by Act of Parliament a perpetual private race-course within two miles of the metropolis, as a focus for vice and profligacy; an elysium for gamblers and swindlers; a standing Bartholomew fair, in a hitherto respectable, populous suburban neighbourhood; a general sporting-house, where, in addition to the licensed and unlicensed crimes of the place, will be concocted every kind of demoralizing and brutal exhibition, from a cock-fight or donkey-match, to those barbarous pugilistic contests, which often terminate—as in a recent case—in murder. But the particular fact which we were about to mention was, that whereas in the Bill there was one decent clause, enacting that the sports shall cease on the Lord's-day, and no beer or spirits be sold on that day, this clause has actually been struck out by the House of Commons' Committee! Is England still a Christian nation? We do not enlarge on the matter, confidently hoping that the whole of this abominable Bill must be rejected on the third reading; but we state this fact as an appalling sign of the times. Let Christian constituents inquire into these things, and do their duty. They involve no party question; for among all parties may be found some determined violators of the laws of God.

We lament to have to notice in another quarter a congenial instance of the moral apathy of men of the world in relation to everything which bears upon Christian legislation; we allude to the rejection, by the East India Company, of Mr. Poynder's motion for enforcing the Company's deceitfully abortive orders against the participation in Pagan idolatry; and the substitution in its place of a resolution—"That the Court

deems the continued public discussion of questions affecting the religious feelings of the natives of India to be fraught with danger, and that the regulation of such matters may with more safety and propriety be left to the responsible Executive." This resolution is both absurd and hypocritical; for there is no question about the natives or their "religious" or irreligious feelings; but only whether British Christians are to be coerced to be parties to their idolatrous and profligate rites; and, as for leaving the question to "the responsible executive," it is like leaving Mr. Hume and Mr. Wakley to legislate for the due observance of the Sabbath. The country must now enforce the matter in earnest, through public opinion or parliamentary interposition; for the cause is lost in Leadenhall-street. We rejoice to see that a few influential petitions have been presented to Parliament on the subject; and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London, have ably and earnestly addressed the House of Lords upon the occasion; but their zealous efforts, with those of the various missionary institutions, and of those bishops, clergymen, and laymen in India, who have memorialised the local authorities, have been hitherto abortive; we might almost say they have been repulsed with insult. We hope that Mr. Poynder will not retire in discouragement or disgust. He abolished Suttees; and we cannot doubt that before long he will be successful here also. The question ought, however, to be taken up in parliament; for, assuredly, the country never delegated to a company of merchants "the right to govern wrong." Will not God visit for these things? will he not be avenged if we repent not of the sordid sins of our commerce, and the licentious sins of our wealth and gaiety?

The Clergy-residence and Anti-plurality Bill has been passing its stages silently in the House of Lords. We regret that it does not at once forbid pluralities, instead of merely limiting them. Any partial measure will lead to endless exchanging and jobbing of advowsons and presentations; whereas once forbid pluralities *in toto*, and every thing will gradually arrange itself in order; due facilities being given to all desirable unions, augmentations, and arrangements of patronage. At the same time we are grateful for what is likely to be effected upon this important question; the very discussion of which has already done much good, by preventing new cumulations.

The West India Apprenticeship question continues to excite much attention. In the House of Peers, Lord Sligo has declared his intention of at once liberating his apprentices; and the Bishop of London has stated that it might perhaps be more safe and satisfactory to settle the question at once, than to wait till the original expiration of the term. The cause of immediate abolition has gained many new advocates; and we confess, as we stated last month, that most of the arguments tend strongly that way; though, if full justice can be procured to the apprentice during the remaining period of his term, we still think it might be wisest not to give the West Indies any pretence for saying that we have broken faith, thus affording them a ready excuse for every evil which may subsequently happen. We have no sympathy for the delinquent planters, who have grievously violated the stipulations of the contract; nor could they truly complain of injustice, especially as they have been already largely overpaid by the twenty millions; but we speak with reference to the eventual benefit of the oppressed party. A discussion of the question is about to come on in the House of Commons; when the chief facts of the case will doubtless be cleared up. The question ought at once to be finally settled; for two years of constant agitation would bode no good to any party.

Lord John Russell proposes a settlement of the Irish church question, by paying the clergy out of the consolidated fund seventy per cent. of the value of their tithe; the public becoming, in return, the tithe owners. This would doubtless give temporary quiet and a regular income to the present race of clergy; and it avoids any direct assertion of the appropriating principle; but an unscrupulous parliament might any day tax, curtail, or alienate the whole rental, and leave the church unprovided for; and on this and various other accounts we view the measure with not a little jealousy.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. S. D.; H. J. H.; T. D.; H. J. D.; A Railway Proprietor; Y.; J. A.; A. B; J. J. K.; R. H.; A Reader of the New Series; Clericus Staffordiensis; H. B.; S. B. H.; A Subscriber; J. H.; Eldonensis; F. E. A., Jun.; J. B. Clericus; L. R. C.; are under consideration.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 5. MAY. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE BEATIFYING EFFICACY OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

For the Christian Observer.

TO know God, and to love God, are identical, for "God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." To love God is the end of man's nature and creation, is substantial and supreme felicity; for God is the centre of perfection, the fountain of blessedness: and, as a modern poet truly teaches, though he spake but of the hollow semblance of the Divine grace, the earth-born counterfeit of this offspring of the skies—

"Love is heaven, and heaven is love."

Happiness is the prime instinct of every sentient being. How many soever the diverging paths into which man may be seduced, still, the prime energy of his nature, the guiding star of his will, the magnet of his affections, is happiness:—and happiness, to a moral being, is but another name for this knowledge and the love of God. Ambition, avarice, sensuality, amusement, ignorance or philosophy, activity or indolence, are but the several materials out of which each would erect his fabric of happiness; that is, are but "the unknown God" whom he ignorantly worships—and worships in vain. For ages, philosophy, falsely so called, groped darkly into the secrets of nature, to discover, if it might, the hidden process by which in nature's womb gold was generated. Instead of nobly launching forth into the realms of space, and seeking to ascend from nature to nature's God; and in a more extended knowledge of His works, to know, and to adore, the mighty and benevolent Architect: instead of devoutly retiring into the calm recesses of the world within man's own bosom, tracing there the labyrinths of moral truth, and in the inner sanctuary of this His chosen temple, finding, and adoring, and enjoying God—it basely grovelled amid the dust, it groped into the bowels of earth, it essayed to go down into hell, and hold unlawful commerce with the invisible world, that it might bring up thence this powerful talisman. It spent its days and nights in fantastic speculations, sinful studies, perilous experiments, and visionary hopes; and when, wasted with unholy vigils, and sick at heart through hope deferred, it at length ventured to look into the alembic on which its last guinea was staked, and which concentrated all the powers of

earth or hell which its skill or fancy could evoke, it found there—emblem of the world's promises—vanity and vexation of spirit!

But even though it had succeeded in the immediate object of its search, and discovered the talisman it sought, would it have increased the sum of human felicity? would it have increased even selfish, individual happiness? Can gold, then,

> —"minister to a mind diseased;
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain;
> And, with some sweet oblivious antidote,
> Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff,
> Which weighs upon the heart."

Can gold extract the stings of conscience? can it quench the unhallowed fires of ambition, of avarice, of impurity? can it controul the fierce and unruly passions, which vex and harass the soul? can it soften down proud, jealous, angry, revengeful feelings? or can it change their nature, and convert them from fiends of hell into ministers of enjoyment? Can it even throw the shield of health over man's vulnerable frame? can it repel the arrows of death as they fly thick on every side, or re-people that lonely waste which his ruthless hand has desolated? can it stop the bleedings of a wounded heart, or satisfy its instinctive appetites after an infinite, an unalloyed, and an eternal good? No. Had it succeeded in the immediate object of its search, and found that spell which would convert every object into gold, it would then but have proved experimentally that it had spent its money for that which is not bread, and its labour for that which satisfieth not.

But whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you—God, who made the world and all things that are therein—God the Father who created you, God the Son who redeemed you, God the Holy Ghost who is ready to sanctify, to comfort, and to bless you for ever. The love of this Triune God is a talisman, which does not indeed convert every object into gold, but which converts, not only every object, but every event, into that to the attainment of which gold was sought for but as a mean—happiness. Thus does the Gospel reveal that secret charm which universal man incessantly procures, but elsewhere seeks in vain, "Acquaint thyself with God, and be at peace:" "thereby good shall come unto thee," for "all things work together for good to them that love God."

We live in a world pregnant with the seeds of sin and misery: a world that, morally, lieth in wickedness; and, physically, is cursed for man's sake. To think of passing through such a world unhurt were visionary and vain. In his natural state, "man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward;" and even in his regenerate state, "in the world he shall have tribulation." But is there no balm in Gilead, no physician there, who can extract the venom from those wounds which the arrows of adversity have inflicted, and thoroughly heal them? Would not a firm belief in the existence of God; a lively faith in His paternal love and His unsleeping providence; a profound conviction that He careth for us, so that the very hairs of our head are all numbered, and that none can harm us if we be followers of that which is good; that it is only if needs be we are in heaviness through manifold temptations, and then that chastenings are but tokens of His love—would not such a faith sweeten the bitters of that cup of life which our heavenly Father had given us to drink?

Would it not strengthen us under the sufferings of that mystical cross on which the world must be crucified unto us, and we unto the world? Would not the various events of Providence, whether prosperous or adverse, be viewed as necessary links in that golden chain of love which Infallible Wisdom had forged to connect the soul with God and happiness—tribulation working patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope holy beatifying love? Should we not, though sorrowful be always rejoicing, though troubled on every side yet not distressed, perplexed but not in despair? Should we not feel though persecuted not forsaken, cast down but not destroyed?

The ways of Providence are indeed often perplexed and mysterious, and seem, at times, to the eye of sense, to indicate any thing rather than compassion and love, when considered as the acts of an omnipotent Being, at whose supreme and sovereign disposal are all things. God is a Being in whose hands are the issues of life and death, and who can cause the voice of mourning, or the voice of joy and gladness, to be heard in our dwellings. At His bidding arise, in regular succession, all the varied circumstances, whether prosperous or adverse, in the history of man. By a volition of his mind He can diffuse around joy or wretchedness, can make or mar a paradise. He can shed (silent, and resistless, and unperceived, as the descending dews of heaven) the elements of health or sickness, pining misery or transporting enjoyment. He can send abroad upon the nations peace, and plenty, and happiness; or pestilence, and famine, and the sword. Yet we are assured that "*all* the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies:" that "all things work together for good to them that love God;" and that even, to such,

> "Behind a frowning Providence
> He hides a smiling face."

But how is this? The fact is, to borrow a just and lively metaphor, that the present dispensations of Providence exhibit to us but the reverse of that embroidered veil which separates the outer court from the sanctuary, the world from the paradise of God. While uninitiated, by the teaching of the Spirit, into those secrets of the Lord which are with them that fear Him, and, indeed, in a certain degree, while here below, we look but upon the wrong side of this veil: we can therefore see but the tangled threads and shapeless pattern, without form, or comeliness, or apparent design. Our carnal hearts, which would set up their rest on earth, mistake those means for the great end; and when some fair design, which our fancy would weave out of these refuse materials of the Divine plan, is crossed by a link which seems to have no other object than to mar our idol scheme, restless discontent, like Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, asks impatiently, Why is this? Blind unbelief demands *proof* of an artificer's skilful mind and master hand; and refuses to be satisfied, unless permitted at once to view that fair design which those crossings in the web of Providence subserve, and to the perfection of which they are essential. In short, men would view, with eyes of flesh, the bright, and well devised, and well executed plan which the other side presents, and on which the eyes of God and of unfallen angels rest—"which things the angels desire to look into," and on which the purified vision of the "spirits of just men

made perfect" continually repose with satisfaction and delight. But this cannot be. We must "walk by faith, and not by sight," amid the perplexities and entanglements of this lower world. We must "be lifted up" from our firm footing upon earth, and "crucified with Christ" upon the mystical cross of faith. This enters essentially into God's plan and purposes towards man. His moral discipline requires this, because without it there could be no virtue. But though all the waves and storms of this troublesome world pass over us—though under the angriest frowns of Providence, and in the darkest night of depression and discomfort, let us only cleave by love to God, and we may rest securely upon the anchor of hope. Let us only believe, and we shall experimentally know, that "all things work together for good to them that love God."

And where is the sincere Christian who cannot add the testimony of his personal experience to this blessed truth, that, amid all the trials of life and terrors of death, faith in the providence and love of God is the shield and salvation of the soul? In speaking of the efficacy of faith, in bearing us through seasons of darkness and depression, I shall use the language of one who describes his own experience —who speaks that he doth know. And if it be said that his language indicates a mind deeply diseased by gloomy and morbid despondency, let it be remembered that for such the Gospel is peculiarly requisite: and also, that the extent of the disease but attests the soundness of the principle, and the power of the remedy which could be efficacious in removing it. What but the Gospel could have nerved such sensitive and vulnerable spirits as Kirke White, as Brainerd, as Henry Martyn; or exhibited such a growth, not only in grace, but in cheerfulness, under continually deepening glooms, as we trace in the highly interesting life—interesting too without incident—of Mrs. Hawkes, lately published.

The passage to which I have alluded says, "In seasons of affliction and trial, as I have moved along the path of my daily pilgrimage, solitary and insulated, and seen the interests and affections of all around me elicited by the affections of social and domestic life, I thank God that I could often—as I always should—feel happy, that since he had been pleased to withhold or to remove these blessings from me, He had at least bestowed them upon others: and *that* charity, which looketh not upon her own things, but also upon the things of others, made me a partner, by sympathy, in their enjoyment. But sometimes, when at such moments of depression my mind morbidly turned inwards upon itself, and contrasted the too bright pictures of youthful, ardent, unchastised imagination, with the tame realities, or more cutting disappointments, of actual life: when memory, glancing rapidly through the history of the past, saw its illuminated spots gradually fading in the distance; when I felt as though I had missed my way in the toilsome journey of life, and could look around but upon a wilderness—that I was truly a stranger upon earth, isolated from the tenderer human sympathies, and as if imprisoned by walls of transparent adamant, which permitted me to see, but not to taste, the genial current of life and happiness which seemed to flow around me, and for which the human heart instinctively thirsts—I confess that at such moments I sometimes felt, combined with this sense of loneliness and desolation, a feverish impatience of spirit, which, unless quelled by a Power mightier than I—even that Power which could

say to the surging waves and raging winds, Peace, be still!—would have soon kindled such a flame in my soul as might have burned to the deepest hell. But when faith suggested to me, that although I could not see the meaning of this dispensation; and although it appeared to me that, if things had been otherwise ordered, I should have been not only happier, but better and more useful,—yet that the reins of universal government were in the hands of Infinite Wisdom, unlimited Power, approved and unutterable Love—that it is only if needs be God's people are in heaviness through manifold temptations —that there must be within me some deeply-seated and dangerous disease which would seize upon the vitals, and sap the springs of spiritual life, if this bitter and wearisome regimen were not prescribed to remove it—when the clouds of unbelief thus cleared away, and faith brightened, and the Spirit itself bore witness with my spirit that I was a child of God; and the Spirit of adoption, crying Abba, Father, appealed with humble confidence to the heart seeing God, "Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love thee"—when faith, then, asked me but to believe that all things should work together for my eternal good; to trust God when, practically, He says, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter;" to believe, really and experimentally, in the feelings of the heart, as in the speculations of the head, that this world is but for a brief space, and then vanisheth away—that this "light affliction which is but for a moment," is designed to work for me "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory"—when I have been enabled thus to realize the existence, the supreme administration, the watchful and continual presence of God, as a Father and a Friend, all my feverish irritation and impatience subsided, and gave place to a tranquillizing sense that my lot was the dispensation of God, and that every circumstance was precisely as He ordered it; a light arose upon the darkness; a peace which passeth all understanding flowed in upon and calmed my agitated spirit. I felt a profound and peaceful assurance of soul, that, if a wish could effect it, I would not, by a wish, alter a single circumstance, however trying, from the order in which Divine Providence and grace had, in wisdom and love, seen fit to place it. I felt that when I mourned and was heavy laden I could come unto Christ—that if I was alone in the world, I was alone with God."

On the other hand, those who know not God, often, in the needful time of trouble, experience, from the absence of this knowledge, bitter anguish. The arrows of adversity rankle in the heart. They look around for the balm of human sympathy and consolation. Disappointed and deceived, they are driven back upon a wounded spirit, and feel a sense of desolation and despair, which those only who have experienced can conceive. When clouds of misfortune overcast the path of him who is not experimentally acquainted with God, there is no ray from eternity to enlighten and dissipate the gloom. In the solitary hours of depression, when his mind is thrown in upon its own resources, it often mournfully asks, and as often answers to itself in the bitterness of despair,

"What is this passing scene?
A peevish April day:
A little sun—a little rain—
And then night sweeps along the plain,
And all things fade away."

All his hopes and his happiness are bounded by this present

world, and this world has now failed them. When friend after friend has departed, and left him to a world of strange voices and unsympathizing hearts; when perhaps that friend, who is dear to him as his own soul, seems about to be torn from his struggling arms and bleeding heart; and that countenance, whose faithful mirror long reflected all his anxieties and hopes, his joys and sorrows, is dimmed and clouded by the cold damps of approaching dissolution; when riches, fickle as the world's friendship, make themselves wings and flee away; when even competency, with all its solid comforts, is at risk; when time is stealing away the bloom of youth and vigour of strength; when disease is sapping, or more violently assaulting, the citadel of life; and, in this hour of dismay, conscience is loudly summoning the guilty and affrighted soul to come, and "appear before the judgment-seat of Christ;" this world of interests presses upon his own feeble arm, and he finds it a sore burden, too heavy for him to bear, yet knows not whither to turn for relief. He has no sense of obligation to a supreme authority, and therefore no prescribed and definite line of duty to regulate and simplify his plans, and, by choosing for him, to save him from numberless distractions and perplexities. In every difficulty he has to balance all conflicting interests; and, when Providence defeats his best concerted plans, he cannot but lament the failure as an untoward accident: with bitter murmuring against every body concerned—against himself, and even against God—he lets in the very fuel and fire of hell into his soul, by mourning over the various other causes and neglected means which might have been more effectual; the more careful precautions, the other physician, the prompter remedies, which might have preserved some beloved idol, now torn—and all, as he supposes, in consequence of this fancied mismanagement and neglect—from his agonized bosom;—the other or additional efforts which would have attained some valued good, or saved him from some deplored evil. If his difficulties press to a certain extent, what is there to prevent the man who has no hopes but in this world from resorting to undue and sinful means for relief and extrication? and at each step he will find that he has but woven another web of entanglement; that he has but plunged deeper into the miry clay of sin; that he has wandered further from the presence of God, the only refuge and happiness of a soul, into the prodigal's far country; that now he has spent all, and there is a mighty famine in that land.

That man alone can walk through life safely and comfortably, who practically recognizes the supreme authority of God:—amid the infinity of conflicting interests, the variety of means and ends, whose simple question is, which is the path of duty? and who, in that path, fears no real evil, because assured that there is an overruling Providence which will keep him in all his ways. His anxious fears of the many things which can injure and kill the body, are all absorbed in that one holy and tranquillizing fear of Him who can destroy both soul and body in hell. He lives a life other than that of the mere body—a life not to be maintained "by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God;" and therefore the first object and interest of his life is not what he shall eat, and what he shall drink, and wherewithal he shall be clothed; but he seeks first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and cheerfully trusts, through the promised blessing upon diligent effort in his daily duties,

that all these necessary things shall be added unto him. But whatever may happen in Providence, he can confidently trust in Grace. Whatever may be given, withheld, or removed, he knows that all things work together for good to them that love God: and therefore, under the most sifting trials of faith and patience, his grand object is, to lay hold upon the security of this promise, by cleaving stedfastly in heart to God. He reads the Apostle's declaration, that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son;" and adopts the Apostle's inference, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not, with him, also freely give us all things." The Apostle's assertion, "We love him because he first loved us," stamps every emotion of holy love as, at once, an image of God and a pledge of felicity. But he knows, not merely upon the testimony of an Apostle, not merely upon the testimony even of Christ himself, but by a blessed experience in his own soul, that "God is love." He has called upon God in his trouble, and found him to be the refuge, the repose, the joy of his heart. Often, when the tempest has beat without, he has fled to the deep recesses of his own soul, where God dwells, and been at rest. Often has he sought that refuge to which the Psalmist guides, "When I am in heaviness I will think upon God." And as often has he found that peace and joy in believing, which confidence in this blessed truth, "When I was in heaviness thou knewest my path," must shed upon every soul, which, like that of the Psalmist, knows that God is omnipotent, and that God is love.

J. M. H.

JOY AND PEACE IN BELIEVING.

For the Christian Observer.

We are warned by our Lord to "count the cost" (Luke xiv. 8) when we enter upon the Christian course; and it is important that we should form a true estimate of it, lest, on the one hand, we should unreasonably be deterred by its difficulties from entering upon it; or, on the other, having entered upon it, we should draw back upon finding our erroneous expectations disappointed. Of wisdom, of that wisdom which is from above, it is declared by Solomon, that "Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace" (Prov. iii. 17). Yet the Apostles exhorted the disciples, saying "That we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Acts xiv. 22). Our Lord reconciled the apparent diversity, when he said to his Apostles, "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer: I have overcome the world" (John xii. 33). The disciple must *in this world* expect tribulation; he has to "deny himself, and take up his cross daily" (Luke ix. 23); but the Great Captain of his salvation has *overcome the world* for him: and the faithful soldier of Christ, following his footsteps, and relying on his strength, and wearing his armour, will also overcome, and will obtain that blessed promise, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. iii. 21.) Having this glorious end of his warfare in view, and enjoying the consolations of the Holy Spirit, he may well be of good cheer.

There are, accordingly, few things more remarkable in the writings of the Apostles, than the frequency and earnestness with which they exhort the disciples to rejoice, and the testimony which they bear to the joy experienced by Christians in those days—"Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord" (Phil. iii. 1). "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice" (Phil. iv. 4). "Rejoice evermore" (1 Thess. v. 16). "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy" (1 Pet. iv. 12, 13.) "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall* into divers temptations; knowing *this*, that the trying of your faith worketh patience" (James i. 2, 3). Such are the exhortations, not addressed to a few individual Christians enjoying a peculiar season of prosperity,—nor yet to some church specially favoured with external peace—but addressed some by the Apostle Paul, when a prisoner at Rome, to the Philippians, to whom it was (he says) "given in behalf of Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake; having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear *to be* in me" (Phil. i. 29, 30): one by St. Peter "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (1 Pet. i. 1), in the anticipation of a *fiery trial*; and another by St. James "to the twelve tribes which" were "scattered abroad" (James i. 1), to whom he holds it forth as a peculiar season of joy, when they should *fall into divers temptations*. Nor did the early Christians fail to observe these exhortations. St. Paul bore witness "of the grace of God, bestowed on the churches of Macedonia" (the churches of Philippi and Thessalonica, to which some of these exhortations were addressed), "how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality" (2 Cor. viii. 1, 2). What a picture of a Christian church! *Abundance of joy in a great trial of affliction!* Rich liberality abounding in deep poverty! Addressing the Hebrews, the same Apostle says, Ye "took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance" (Heb. x. 34). And St. Peter, to the disciples whom he exhorted to rejoice concerning the fiery trial which was to try them, writes concerning the "salvation ready to be revealed in the last time;" wherein (he says) "ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold which perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ: whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see *him* not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, *even* the salvation of *your* souls" (1 Pet. i. 5—9.) These Christians were in *heaviness through manifold temptations;* their faith was under *trial;* yet they *rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory.* How faithful is He, who to godliness gave "the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come!" (1 Tim. iv. 8.)

* The word *fall* should be observed. The Apostle is speaking of those *trials* into which Christians are brought by the Providence of God—not of the temptations to which from presumption or carelessness they voluntarily expose themselves.

Is not the same promise made to us also? Is not our God "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever?" (Heb. xiii. 8.) Let us, then, seek to obtain this promise—let us inquire how these saints of old attained to this joy and peace in believing: it was not by shunning the "fiery trial;" they were "partakers of Christ's sufferings;" they accounted it a *gift* "to suffer for his sake;" they fell "into divers temptations, and were in a great trial of affliction:" nor was it in the possession of wordly goods that they rejoiced—they were "in deep poverty;" they "took joyfully the spoiling of their goods. Whence then this joy and peace in believing? They *loved* our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: they *believed* in Him: they hoped to have in heaven a better and an enduring substance." Thus they abounded in love, in faith, in hope. They loved Jesus Christ, though they had not seen Him; they believed in Him, though they saw him not. Thus living and believing, they rejoiced in the hope that the trial of their faith would be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ; they rejoiced, inasmuch as they were partakers of Christ's sufferings, that when his glory should be revealed they might be glad also with exceeding joy; they rejoiced in the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time, and thus even in this life received the end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls.

Let us, after their example, cultivate this love, faith, and hope. Let us earnestly pray that the Holy Spirit may pour in rich abundance these excellent gifts into our hearts. Let us meditate on "the breadth and length and depth and height" of "the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge" (Eph. iii. 18, 19), till we love him because he first loved us. Then shall we "count all things *but* loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus" our "Lord" (Phil. iii. 8). Let us meditate on his faithfulness and power, as well on his love. Let us meditate on Him "that is holy," Him "that is true," Him "that hath the key of David," Him "that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth" (Rev. iii. 7). Let us meditate on Him, on his love, and power, and faithfulness, till with all our heart we love him, and with implicit faith trust in Him; then shall we take up our cross daily and follow him; then shall we cheerfully suffer or even die with him, knowing that "if we be dead with *him*, we shall also live with *him*: if we suffer, we shall also reign with *him*" (2 Tim. ii. 11, 12). Lastly, let us meditate on that "inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away," which is "reserved in heaven for" those "who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation" (1 Pet. i. 4, 5); an inheritance not liable to the changes of this perishing world, but reserved in heaven; an inheritance reserved, not for those who have strength in themselves to keep themselves, but for those *who are kept by the power of God*. Let us meditate on this blessed inheritance, and on the power and love and faithfulness of Him by whom it is reserved for his adopted children in Christ Jesus, and by whom they are kept for it; and then, if we love Jesus Christ who purchased it for us with his blood; if we believe in Him who "hath loved us, and hath given himself for us" (Eph. v. 2), and is gone before "to prepare a place for" his disciples, and has promised to "come again and receive" them to himself; that where he is, there they may be also (John xiv. 2, 3); if we love him as our Saviour, and believe in him as "the way, the truth, and the life" (ib. 6); we may (not only in prosperity,

but even in heaviness) "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." To such He has left his peace (John xiv. 27). Yea, He hath promised, "If a man love me he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (ib. 23). Their "fellowship *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ;" surely then their "joy may be full" (1 John i. 3, 4). They may for a season be "in heaviness through "manifold temptations" of the world, the flesh, and the devil; they may "mourn" over temporal afflictions, or over the ungodliness that prevails around them; they *will* mourn over the sins of their past lives, and over the sin that still dwelleth in them; they may be "troubled on every side, without" may be "fightings, within fears;" but these are the very circumstances in which they have our Lord's promise that "they shall be comforted"—his legacy of his own "peace;" these are the circumstances in which the disciples of old rejoiced "with joy unspeakable and full of glory" (1 Pet. vi. 8; Matt. v. 4; John xii. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 5, 7). Yea, their heavenly Father may for a time "hide" his "face" from them: and then indeed they will be "troubled," but when they "cry" to him he will "turn for" them their "mourning into dancing;" he will "put off" their "sackcloth, and" gird them "with gladness:" his "anger *endureth but* a moment; in his favour is life; weeping may endure for a night, but joy *cometh* in the morning" (Psalm xxx.)

Φιλος.

ON THE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF SCRIPTURE.

(*Continued from page* 228.)

For the Christian Observer.

WE continue the paper with which Mr. Bickersteth has favoured us, and purpose concluding it in our next Number:—

"The Epistles then, in general, are a great code of Christian practice, directly addressed, by the Spirit, to the Gentile churches, and which, therefore, have the first claim on our deep and prayerful meditation. Some of them are more, others less immediately applicable to the present state of the church of Christ, and therefore may demand various degrees of close and diligent study. But they form together a beautiful and blessed first-fruits of the kingdom of righteousness, peace and love, and open to our hopes a bright pathway into that world to come, where every heart in earth and heaven shall be a living epitome of their full, deep, and fervent love, a living epistle of Christ; and every family and every nation, blessed in the son of Abraham, and governed by the son of David, shall dwell thus in the grace of Christ their Lord, in the love of God, and the fellowship of the Spirit. Still, as the law, though itself perfect, converting the soul, was weak through the flesh, so these Epistles, the spiritual law of the church, in the lapse of years, have grown weak through unbelief. The church was then mainly a separate body; it is now mingled with the world. The doctrines of the Gospel had then their early freshness and power; the cross of Christ was a fact and history; now they reach us under the deadening power of habit, education, controversy, and long abuse. The vessel of truth, then launched from the shore of Judea upon the sea of the nations, was still in sight of land; it has since lost sight of port, has endured a terrible tempest, and seemed ready to be wrecked between the two seas of superstition and infidelity, and to be cast out almost upon remote and strange islands; so that we may well seek to cast anchor, and wish for day. We have a glorious vision of love set before us; but centuries of darkness have intervened; the church has sunk in purity, as its bounds have been enlarged; the world seems still almost as full of evil as ever; we see no signs, there is no prophet any more. The course of providence is still, by emphasis, the 'mystery of God.' We need something to assure us that the glory of the

apostolic church has not left us for ever; to assist our faith in the truth that God's purpose of love is still advancing; to surround us with the continual sense of his ceaseless providence; to establish us in the hope of the approach of His universal kingdom; and in the fresh temptations, snares, and dangers, the new forms of error and devices of Satan that assail the church, to preserve us from falling on every side, to furnish us with wisdom and light in our daily course amidst present scenes, and thus to guide our feet in the ways of peace.

"The books of Daniel and the Apocalypse are designed, by the Spirit of God, to effect for his church these important ends. That such was their proper and distinct object, may appear from several reasons. They are, in contrast with all the others, Gentile prophecies. The first, though written by a Jewish prophet, were revealed in part to Nebuchadnezzar, the head of the Gentile monarchies, and written in Chaldee, the language of his court and people; and the prophet himself was high in station both in the Babylonian and Persian empires. The Apocalypse, again, written by one of the twelve who had received the universal commission of the gospel, was by Christ himself expressly sent to the Gentile churches, with the sanction of a special blessing at its opening and its close. Their common symbolic nature also separates them from the others, and points them out as referring mainly to the present dispensation, when the church is set free from the limits of a single nation, and visible and local ordinances, and its history demands the use of a natural and universal language. In the gospels, again, Daniel is the only prophet whom our Lord commends by name to the diligent search of his disciples. And it seems plainly to be the inquiries in his last chapter and the answer they received, to which St. Peter refers in the words, 'Unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister those things which are now revealed unto you, by those who have preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.'

"The Epistles themselves supply another mark of this intended connexion. We have seen that the Spirit of God directed each of the two great apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, after sending an Epistle full of practical exhortation in the Christian life, to follow it by another, as its supplement, which is little else than a summary of those prophecies. The second Epistle to the Thessalonians is little more than a brief and vivid sketch of the antichristian power already described in Dan. vii. and xi., and afterwards more fully in the book of Revelation. And this is given as a guard against being deceived, either by word, or spirit, or letter, as from the apostle himself; thus teaching that his own Epistles may be an occasion of error and dangerous delusion, unless they are joined with the faithful warnings of those prophets. The second Epistle of St. Peter has nearly the same character. The apostle, in stirring up the pure minds of the disciples, reminds them that they do well to take heed to the sure word of prophecy; and bids them to be mindful of the words spoken before by the holy prophets, as well as of the commandment of the apostles of the Lord and Saviour. This appears to be, in his view, the great means of fulfilling the charge to 'grow in grace and the knowledge of Jesus Christ.' The chief difference between these two epistles, in their prophetic reference, seems to be that the latter, as addressed to Hebrew Christians, refers more closely to Isaiah, as the former to Daniel.

"The importance of these two great Gentile prophecies, Daniel and St. John, in connexion with the Epistles, and as the second branch of Scripture research, deserves to be briefly unfolded. They meet all the wants, which Christians in the present day must experience in the others, when taken alone, and which were referred to before. Do we feel painfully, that distance of place, and the lapse of ages, with the abounding of iniquity, have weakened the hold of our faith on the glorious truths which burn and glow in the writings of the Apostles, till we are vexed with secret questionings of the constant presence of Christ to his church, and the providence of God in the world? Our faith here receives abundant succour, our questioning and doubts a full reply. The great chart of God's providence is laid before us, and we see clearly portrayed the succession of the four great empires, which were to bear away during Israel's desolation, and the changing forms and spiritual features of the last of these, under which our own lot hath been cast, till the glorious issue in the kingdom of God. Do centuries of darkness and corruption raise a thick cloud before our eyes, and blot from our hearts the truth, depth, and fervency of God's love to an evil world, in the sufferings and death of his dear Son, as they shone so brightly in the first dawning of that day-spring from on high? We have here a sure word of prophecy to which we do well to take heed, as to a light shining through all the darkness of that long history of crime, till the mists and shadows flee away, and that day-spring rise afresh on our hearts in the fulness of his dying love. Are we perplexed by

the high privileges of the Christian church and its ordinances, described in the Epistles, when we have to apply them to a state so different; tempted either by an adherence to the letter, as though baptism were salvation, and the Christian name a passport to life, to confound the landmarks of good and evil; or else to make void the ordinances in their abuse, and count the Christian covenant an unholy thing? We are here armed against either danger. We learn that as of old, so in the Christian church, all are not Israel that are of Israel, and yet that to the faithful, in times of greatest darkness, the promise stands firm, and the ordinances of grace keep their power; that when all things seem darkest, God has reserved to himself a remnant; and that soon the day will break, and the shadows flee away, and light and everlasting glory dawn on the church of God. Or if secured in a measure, by personal experience of the blessedness of the Gospel, from the former dangers, are we in danger of a spiritual selfishness and pride, fancying ourselves to have attained all knowledge that is practical or profitable; and, wrapped in our own comfort, to grow careless of the danger of a perishing world? We have in these books a remedy for both evils. There is here a depth and a mystery, which we can very faintly explore; to rebuke the pride of our fancied wisdom, and bring us to our right station of learners, as little children, at the feet of Christ. And there is a view also given us of the stubbornness of the heart of man, and of the unwearied patience and exhaustless grace of God, that may well both humble us to the dust, and stir us up to deep compassion for our brethren, and adoring praise of the Divine goodness. In the light of that deep counsel of God's covenant love, our wisdom is confounded with the sense of its own folly, and our spiritual selfishness grows too dark and hateful to be endured. Here too we gain light on the immediate prospects of the church, the dangers to which it is presently exposed, the truths most instantly needful; the perils already escaped, the troubles which yet remain; the past yields all the encouragement of mercies already received and victories already gained; the future, of hopes to be quickly fulfilled, and still larger triumphs of truth and righteousness.

"Such is the second great branch of Scriptural inquiry. The writings of many learned and pious men may afford valuable aid in this pursuit; still the chief means of success are the direct comparison, first of Daniel with the Apocalypse, then of both with other prophecies, and lastly with the events of history. In this field every age—nay, every prayerful inquirer—may expect increasing light in the due improvement of that which God has already given: 'Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. The wise shall understand.' At the Reformation there was a great opening of these prophecies; we are probably now on the verge of one still more full and clear, and by which their connexion, harmony, and fulness of Divine wisdom shall be still further displayed. A few remarks may be here ventured on the general scope of the successive visions, and which may serve as a key to more minute and detailed research, as it is indeed itself the result of a somewhat close and extended inquiry.

"The visions of Daniel were given in the court of Babylon, when the captivity of Israel and the times of the Gentiles, spoken of by our Lord (Lev. xxi.), were just begun. They set before us the great features of God's providence, during the long season of Judah's political rejection, till the kingdom should be restored to Israel, and all nations be blessed under the rule of the Son of David, the promised Messiah of God. But as they pertained chiefly to the times of the Christian covenant, which was a yet unopened mystery (Eph. iii.), they were sealed from a full discovery till the times of the end, and the length of the season they embraced was veiled under mystic terms. The Apocalypse is a more full unfolding of those events, obscurely revealed in the former, which properly belonged to the Christian dispensation, or the season of the mystery of God (Rev. x.), until the promised redemption of the kingdoms of the world (Rev. xi. 19).

"The first vision of the great image stands apart from the rest, and is a brief summary of the world's political history, so far as connected with the church, until the kingdom of God shall come. We there see four great empires, forming together, in the eye of man, a glorious image of human power, which are succeeded by the everlasting kingdom of Christ. The descent, in this emblem, from gold down to iron mingled with clay, besides the separate meaning of each, seems to describe the deepening earthliness which Divine truth inflicts, by a just retribution, on the nations that resist its heavenly power, till they are sunk, from their first shew of strength and grandeur, to that sensual, earthly selfishness which makes them as potters' vessels, ready to be broken to shivers by Christ's iron rod. Four histories, of the nature of prophetic parables, follow this vision,

to shew the spiritual nature and acts of these kingdoms, with the final issue in their redemption. The first (in chap. iii.) describes the idol-worship of the Gentile powers, and their persecution of the saints of God; with the support vouchsafed to these in the midst of their sufferings, and the effect of God's power and mercy as thus displayed towards his servants, in the full conversion of the earth's kingdoms. The second (in chap. iv.) exhibits the true glory of government, the protection, shelter, and sustenance of all who dwell beneath its shade; the long season, when, by ambition and pride, it should be stripped of this glory, and sunk into bestial debasement; and its restoration at length to its true office and dignity, by the acknowledgment, worship, and praise of the Most High. The third (in chap. v.) seems to describe that state of luxury, joined with sacrilege, which is to be suddenly followed by the fall of the world's empires, and the kingdom of the true Cyrus, with the kings from the east (Rev. xvi. 16), the builder of the heavenly temple. The last (in chap. vi.) seems designed as a type of our Lord's own history, the true Daniel, or judge appointed by God; first, by the malice of his enemies cast into the lion's den (Psalm xxii.); and for these his sufferings exalted at length to a name above every name, while all his enemies are made his footstool.

"The other visions, directly given to the prophet, then succeed. The four empires, exhibited before in their outward splendour, appear in these in their true character during their bestial corruption and madness, as devouring beasts of prey. The seventh chapter details the rise, succession, and distinct features of each; but dwells mainly on the little horn, a persecuting power that was to arise in the latter times of the fourth empire, or Western Rome, and to join the eyes and mouth of the prophet with the horn, or symbol of kingly power. The eighth chapter exhibits the second and third empires, explained by the angel to denote the king of Media and Persia, and the king of Grecia; but chiefly relates to a little horn that was to appear in the latter time of the four divided Macedonian kingdoms, to cast down the sanctuary, and take away the daily sacrifice; in other words, the Roman power, as it should arise in the eastern, or third empire, and reaching to the time of its last acts, at the restoration of Israel and the cleansing of the sanctuary. The ninth chapter unfolds the ecclesiastical features which attend this former vision. Its whole period is distinguished into two parts; the first of seventy weeks, determined for the continuance of the Jewish polity till the coming of the Messiah, and the remnant one of desolation to ensue upon his rejection, till the consummation arrive, and the covenant be renewed with Israel. The eleventh and twelfth chapters form a supplement to the others, and contain a more detailed history of the political changes, from the time of the prophets onward to the last great tribulation and Judah's return; while unfolding briefly the features of the Antichristian power, which was to bear so large a share in the eventful history of the latter days.

"The order and connexion is nearly the same in the visions of the Revelation. The first, as in Daniel, standing apart from the rest, portrays, in the Epistles to the seven churches, the spiritual states of the Catholic church, from the season of its first love to that of Laodicean decay, when the receiving of the Jews is to prove as life from the dead. We there see it first in the decline of its Apostolic zeal and love; then in its revival under Pagan persecution; in its exaltation to the high places of power; in its struggles with the thickening corruptions of the papacy, at last triumphant; in its subsequent state of doctrinal correctness, but spiritual decay; in its approaching revival, attended with a first fruits of converted Jews; and in its lukewarmness, when the candlestick is taken from the Gentiles, and the Gospel returns to Jerusalem again.

"The vision of the seven seals is next in order. Here the church visible and militant is revealed as the means of the great and lasting changes in the world's empire, till its assumption by the Lamb. We have successively the seasons of its purity and triumph; of heresy and religious strife; of ceremonial bondage and spiritual famine; of idolatry, secular cruelty, and persecution; the stifled cry of the martyrs, emerging at the Protestation of the Princes; the late earthquake, which has convulsed the nations, and changed the firmament of power; a silence and pause in heaven, while four angels hold the winds, and the sealing of the last tribes is completing in the visible church; followed by an innumerable ingathering out of the heathen lands, in the great tribulation which precedes the coming of the Lord.

"The vision of the seven trumpets succeeds. These give a view of those main judgments by which the Roman empire was to be broken, that a way might be prepared for the more full and rapid progress of the gospel of peace. Four of these are political; the three last have a spiritual character, and fall upon 'the

men,' or outward professors of the Christian name. The first reveals the barbarian ravages of the undivided empire; the second, the fall and extinction of Western Rome; the third, the religious feuds that distracted the Eastern Empire; the fourth, the long eclipse of its splendour. The fifth exhibits the woe of the Saracens; the sixth, the days of chivalry, and the conflicts of the crusaders and the Turks, issuing in the fall of the Eastern Empire. The ninth chapter closes when this woe is at its height, and the idolatry also of the Western church. The tenth and eleventh continue the history, with the cloudy dawn of Gospel truth; the revival of the witnesses slain before, and exposed without burial; a renewed commission of Apostolic preaching against idolatry; the building of the temple, or true church; and the casting out of the court profaned by the Gentiles, or the formal rejection of the Papacy. Then ensues, as before, the earthquake, with the sudden extinction of the Christian name in one of the ten papal kingdoms; and the passing away of the Turkish power, previous to the third or final woe. The vision of the three following chapters reveals to us the spiritual church in its early beauty, its sufferings and conflicts, its wilderness sojourning; its partial emergence and renewed Gospel messages, with its full and final victories. Lastly, the vials describe, in fuller details, those political judgments which in these times have prepared the way for the great conflict and triumph of the Lamb and his faithful and chosen followers. Such appears to be the leading scope of each vision; the passages in the Epistles, Rom. ix. xi.; 1 Cor. xv.; 1 Thes. iv. 13—18; 2 Thess. ii. 1—12; 1 Tim. iv. 1—5; 2 Tim. iii. 1—13; James v. 1—9; 1 Peter iv. 12—19; 2 Peter ii. iii., and the Epistle of St. Jude, will serve as links to connect the former subject with the present, and receive and reflect much light by the mutual comparison.

"These two prophets, whose visions are now drawing to a close, both set before our view an approaching restoration of Israel, a kingdom of Christ, when the way of the kings from the east shall be prepared, and the scattering of the holy people accomplished. On the nature, however, of that kingdom, so full of deepest interest, they give few particulars. They lead us by the hand through the course of the Gentile dispensation, called the hidden mystery (Eph. iii.), to the time when that mystery shall be finished (Rev. x.), and the Lord shall build up Zion, and appear in his glory. Their special commission there ceases, at least for a time, and they remand us to the Jewish prophecies for a fuller view of that promised kingdom. These will therefore open a third field of Scripture inquiry. Their inspired writings, from Isaiah to Malachi, set before us the political and outward form of the world's promised blessedness, as the Gospel reveals its quickening spirit and heavenly glory. On this copious and long-neglected subject, many remarks might well be made. A few may perhaps smooth a little the path into this wide and untrodden field."

(*To be continued.*)

ON THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I WAS glad to observe that a writer in your last Number (see the paper on the expectation of an individual Antichrist, page 232) has had the courage to call the attention of your readers to the question of the literal and spiritual interpretation of certain unfulfilled prophecies;—I say the courage, because in some circles a writer is almost unchristianized if he does not follow the opinion therein current in some of the matters which your correspondent alludes to. Among the points which he mentions is the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine; in favour of which there is a much more general concurrence of opinion, than in any other of the particulars noticed by him, such as the personal reign of Christ upon earth; a personal Antichrist yet to be revealed; the literal interpretation of the 1260 prophetic days, as days of twenty-four hours and not of years; and the like. It would instruct and gratify many of the readers of your new series

to see in your pages a temperate, Scriptural, and brotherly discussion of some of these interesting questions; for however dark may seem the page of unfulfilled prophecy, a special blessing is pronounced upon the study of it.

But confining my attention, for the present, to one of these points, I send you the following outline of the chief arguments against the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine, which was put into my hands several years ago as being the heads of "Twelve Letters to a Friend," published without name, and which I propounded at the time to some zealous advocates for the literal interpretation, without receiving from them a satisfactory reply to the objections, which are as follow:

"1. Because unsupported by the New Testament.

"2. Because at variance with the genius of Christianity.

"3. Because the allusions in the New to the language of the Old Testament, and the use made of those allusions, are opposed to it.

"4. Because there are phrases, terms, and passages in the Old Testament, which cannot be taken literally, or without qualification; and which yet have an equal claim to be so taken with the phraseology adduced in support of a literal restoration; while the literal meaning of others is negatived, some by New Testament authority, and some by the mode of their collocation, or by the sense expressly attached, or otherwise attaching to them.

"5. Because there was only one prophet (Malachi) after the last reformation of Nehemiah, until the Christian æra, and he does not predict any future deliverance of the Jewish nation; thus leaving us to conclude that the predictions of former prophets were fulfilled, as to their literal import, on the return from Babylon, and the subsequent prosperity, and, therefore, had no reference to the present dispersion.

"6. Because the doctrine is encumbered with certain difficulties, which are not necessary to be encountered, because obviated by an interpretation more simple and more in harmony with the general tenor of the word of God, than that upon which the said doctrine is built.

"The difficulties are of three kinds:

"(1.) Arising from the magnitude of the events necessarily implied.

"(2.) Arising from the ordinary course of things.

"(3.) Arising from the apparent contradiction to Scripture testimony which the doctrine involves.

"7. Because the doctrine is fruitless of good, and prolific of bad effects on the public mind in general, and on the minds of the Jews in particular."

I have not the advantage of knowing the arguments by which the writer supported these heads of objection; but I confess that my own examination of Scripture leads me to think there is more weight in them than some of my brethren will allow. A clear and satisfactory reply would oblige myself and many other of your readers. There is no question as to the promised restoration of the Jews to the favour of God; or as to the duty of Christians to pray and labour for their conversion; the only point is whether there is any promise of their literal restoration to Palestine.

PAULINUS.

REMARKS ON THE PROPHETIC 1260 DAYS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

To the various articles and letters which are in the course of introduction into your new series of the Christian Observer—a work deservedly held in estimation in respect to its literary talent and piety—permit an occasional correspondent in some of your former volumes to offer a few remarks in reference to the periods of prophetical days,

by Daniel, and in the Revelation of St. John. I do not, however, wish to draw the attention of your readers to questions of unfulfilled predictions; in deciding upon which many have erred; but to one of accomplishment rather than of speculation. I know from Mr. Dodsworth's own mouth, as well as from his printed sermons, that one of the strongholds of the Oxford Tract position, relative to the indefectible Apostolic succession of the visible church, and its consequent unerring tradition, is, that, according to the statements of an unsatisfactory pamphlet, published by the Rev. Mr. Maitland of Gloucester, which he judges to be unanswerable, the period of 1260 days, comprised in the reign of Antichrist, and exemplified by the depression of the true and spiritual church, signifies a literal and unfulfilled portion of time which will be included in days of twenty-four hours' duration. By this assertion he entirely evades those verses of the inspired word, which stamp Popery with the appellations of the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity, and the great harlot. He thus sets aside the doctrine of the Romish apostacy which was held by our Reformers; softens down the error of the Romish church into a more venial heresy and schism; and is ready to shake hands with her as the true spouse of Christ and our sister, whenever she shall be willing to consubstantiate instead of transubstantiate the consecrated wafer, and to make a few alterations in her mode of worship and discipline. The Christian mind is hereby led astray from the plain denunciation of the Bible against the Church of Rome on the one hand, and is urged forward on the other to speculate upon some future Infidel Antichrist, which shall arise in the world and in the church.

Now I doubt not that there both have been, and are, and will be, many Antichrists; and that the Church will be subjected to an Infidel, as well to a Pagan and Papal, persecution; but I will never renounce the Protestant declaration, that the Pope is "Antichrist," and that as such he is especially marked in the volume of infallibility. Nothing can be plainer and more conclusive than that the time of 1260 days means so many years instead of days, whatever difficulty may arise in the settlement of that particular date which the Holy Spirit has fixed for their commencement, and which I am not here discussing. "After the number of the days," says God, "in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my breach of promise." (Numbers xiv. 34). Again: "Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it: according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it, thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days. I have appointed thee each day for a year." (Ezekiel iv. 4, 5, 6). In both these passages years are denoted by days, and the word day is used indefinitely in other parts of Scripture.

But let us apply Scriptural analogy to historical matter of fact. Has not such an ecclesiastical and political power arisen in the world, since the Christian era, as is answerable to the prophetical descriptions in the books of Daniel and the Apocalypse? Can any unpreju-

diced mind advert to the rise, decline, and fall of the Roman Empire, its dismemberment, and the present state of those kingdoms into which it has been divided, and not feel assured that this very empire is the same as that which has been portrayed by inspired penmen? Though Mahometanism was a somewhat similar, and a nearly simultaneous, delusion, yet the characters of persecution and idolatry are distinctly marked by the Western rather than by the Eastern defection; and even were the same Scripture applicable to both, which I believe to be separately delineated, the admission would not at all disprove my argument. An opponent may as well attempt to convince me that such a person as Julius Cæsar, for example, was a fictitious individual; and that his Commentaries of wars in Gaul, which have been handed down to posterity, are a romance, of which he was not the author, and in which he was not the agent; but that they were allegorically descriptive of some future emperor or hero, who may arise in the kingdom of France, or of battles which remain yet to be fought in the destinies of that nation. As well might I believe that the works of the Roman historians, Livy and Tacitus, are forgeries, or those of the Grecian Herodotus and Xenophon, or those of the Jewish Josephus. In like manner the future accomplishment of 1260 days, in which the church shall be persecuted, and the rise of some yet undeveloped infidel power, who shall become the persecutor, whether true or not, are pure conjecture. Under this notion nearly the whole of the Apocalypse, with the exception of the epistles to the seven churches, is declared to be a sealed and unfulfilled document; though that very book commences with the announcement of a blessing to its faithful perusal, and terminates with the denouncement of a curse, even all the plagues therein written, against its unfaithful interpretation. Such language must indeed be understood as not exclusively, though specially, confining itself to the Apocalypse; but as generally applicable also to the whole Bible. The promise is an encouragement to the sincere and humble inquirer, and the denunciation is a warning against the wilfully blind unbelievers. It is my confident persuasion that a great part of that book has been fulfilled, and is now fulfilling; while I would not deny that the very vials which have been poured out, or may be now in the act of being poured out, upon the guilty nations of the world, may yet have an ulterior, subsequent, and more complete fulfilment, at a yet more distant period of futurity, when the dregs of them will be emptied. If any man asks of me, when the Lord will come, I reply, that I know not the hour, the day, nor the year! Nor can any living human being, or angelic spirit, presume to determine, with absolute certainty, that his advent must and will be delayed for the space of one century or another. The counsel of Eternal Wisdom has fixed the time, and planned the circumstances of the event. If I am then asked how He will come, I can only refer the interrogator to the prophetic portions of Holy Scripture, whether it be providentially, spiritually, or personally; which views, to my mind, are all of them reconcilable with each other, and with that revealed truth which will hereafter be more clearly elucidated.

Mr. Dodsworth not only maintains the holy line of the apostolic church through the dark ages, but the contradiction and inconsistency that in the apostolic age the Christians then alive could not ascertain whether or not the Lord might not come to judgment during their

lives; both of which assertions I must venture to deny, according to the signification of his terms.

1. The Lord could not intend to deceive his people, which would be a blasphemous supposition; nor could he be ignorant of his own decreed will, and therefore could not be himself deceived; neither could he be willing that they should deceive themselves on any subject in which their vital, spiritual, and eternal interests were concerned and involved. If an objector states that my system is no better than fatalism, I answer that there is as much difference between the two as between the fabulous divinity of Jupiter and the nature and attributes of Jehovah, the superstition and vanity of Heathenism and the mellowness and raciness of the Gospel. Were, then, the followers of Christ to look for the immediate accomplishment of the prophecies relating to himself or not? The language of inspiration is explicit upon the point. The Apostle Paul thus addresses the Thessalonians: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not *soon* shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ *is at hand*. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." The Apostle then proceeds to characterize the rise and progress of the Papal Antichrist. Again, he writes to Timothy: "Now the Spirit speaketh *expressly* that in the *latter times* some shall depart from the faith;" and he then enters into the details of an apostacy, which, if incipient at the time when he wrote, could not have attained, till after the lapse of centuries, its full height and completion. The Apostle Peter also uses these words with reference to the first advent of Christ:—"Of which salvation the prophets have inquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what or *what manner of time* the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. *Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves* but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into." It seems then to be extremely improbable that the Apostles themselves, who, though fallible men, had received a new and infallible revelation, should be deluded in regard to the second advent of Christ. The primitive Christians were indeed enjoined to look forward to the resurrection; to be borne upwards upon the wings of faith and love, and to over-leap the bounds of time and space, as respects the assurance of their hope and the security of the promise; so that the event in question was presented, not to their imagination, but to their belief, as the goal of their race and the consummation of their felicity. It caused the waters of Jordan to subside, or to be dried up, while they passed through them; and it blunted or disarmed the weapon of the last executioner, whether it were the ordinary blow of death or the extraordinary torture of martyrdom; while it opened to their view the glorious mount of transfiguration. They were not, however, to lose or bewilder their reason by the anxious and present expectation of these future events, which it could never have been the Divine ordination should at that time take place; but to pass patiently their pilgrimage upon earth, and

wait their appointed time of dismissal from it. If I may draw a comparison between embodied and disembodied saints, and between things earthly and heavenly, I can conceive that spiritual beings, as an illustration of what I have just stated, may reckon time with enlarged and exalted faculties of which I can form no adequate comprehension, and that as the past and future are one everlasting *now* to the Infinite Mind; so to the finite intelligence of redeemed spirits, the hours, days, and years of this world's yet unaccomplished destination, may appear only as a present and progressing eternity; while they cannot but know that after the manner of human computation the resumption of their glorified bodies is still a part of the Divine purpose towards them, which remains yet to be fulfilled at the determined season. They are thus represented as inquiring how long it will be before God will revenge the blood of his people which has been shed upon the earth; though they cannot be supposed to be influenced by any feelings of private and personal anger; but breathing everlasting love, they can at the same time acquiesce in, and even desire, without the admixture of sin, the glorification of Divine justice.

2. If the early Christians were not warranted in entertaining the then present belief of their Lord's return to judgment, it must have been the revealed will of God that a series of events should intervene between their warrantable hope, and its fruition or possession. Accordingly we may suppose that some of them read the Apocalypse, which was written about the year A.D. 96; and the Jewish converts in particular were acquainted with their own prophets. In those Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, which coincide, they must have found—though it was not their province to interpret fully, those times and seasons which the Father had placed in his own power—that predicted apostacy, and the definite duration of 1260 years, during which dark and tyrannical period the Lord would raise up faithful witnesses to his truth, until the trumpet of the Gospel should again be blown, and a general dissemination of the Scriptures, whose golden stores have been most iniquitously locked up, should accompany the work of civilization. If, therefore, to us who are now living in the year 1838, such events have actually occurred, or are occurring, and which we believe to be preparatory to a yet future great tribulation, and the consequent enlargement of the Redeemer's kingdom, does not the evidence, which was only a matter of obscure credence to the first Christians, amount to demonstration as respects ourselves; and may we not safely affirm, without the indulgence of curious solicitude, that 1260 days are 1260 years, even though we may not be able to lay our fingers upon the precise event whence that period of time is to be calculated, and even though we may not be infallibly sure whether that portion of it has yet wholly elapsed, or whether it may not have even more than elapsed? We are not indeed favoured again with the miraculous interposition of an incarnate Deity, or with a new and immediate revelation of his will; but we enjoy many other advantages over the primitive Christians,—more facility of access to the collected canon of Scripture, more comprehensive means of grace, more freedom from open molestation, more varied and elaborate acquirements of human condition, and more experience from the retrospective example of the church. I am not asserting that these temporal gifts of Providence are always consecrated talents, nor that the crucible of affliction is not still rendered necessary to separate the slag of abused prosperity.

The march of intellect in our times is too frequently unaccompanied by the inculcation of Christian principles throughout the continent of Europe; and popular education in Great Britain and Ireland is too likely to supplant the Scriptural instruction of the Established Church. Knowledge, therefore, which is a neutral between virtue and vice, and is in itself a blessing in preference to the ignorance of the dark centuries, has especial need of being rightly directed, and turned from the deadly channel of infidelity into the stream of spiritual life. With all this multiplication, then, of natural and acquired endowments, may they not render us the more culpably responsible? Do not mankind reason and act in a more rational manner in the case of reversionary property, or the mortgage of an estate, than in that under consideration; and is not the title of Butler's Analogy strictly true—"The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature?" What is even more remarkable, it has been proved by a professor at Lausanne, by astronomical computations, that the period of 1260 years is one of the most perfect cycles of time, in which the sun and the moon meet together in the same point of the ecliptic from which they set out, within the fewest hours, minutes, and seconds; so that the same is stamped upon the material heavens as well as upon the pages of Revelation. I have not myself the scientific capacity to decide whether such a computation be correct or not, and therefore I do not adduce it in my favour with satisfactory assurance; but, coming from so respectable a quarter, its authority is deserving of research, and not of unexamined rejection. If, therefore, such be the truth and matter of fact, and prophecy be of no private interpretation, as affirmed by the Apostle Peter, Mr. Dodsworth cannot possibly substantiate the Romish succession of episcopacy in the sense in which he understands it, and to the Samaritan and uncovenanted exclusion of every other form of church government.

F. S.

*** For the sake of brevity, and in order not to perplex the question of the 1260 prophetic days with another quite extrinsic to it, we have omitted a few concluding paragraphs of our correspondent's paper, in which he states his opinions upon ecclesiastical polity. With regard to the 1260 days, we have not a shadow of doubt that the great majority of Protestant commentators are right in making them to be years; though we agree with our correspondent in thinking that the exact date of the commencement of the epoch is not yet clearly demonstrated. The argument about the astronomical cycle appears to us quite irrelevant. We will only add, that when our correspondent objects to the doctrine of "the indefectible apostolic succession of the visible church," we conclude that he intends to lay a stress upon the qualifying epithet "visible," meaning what he states with fuller qualification in the words "the Romish succession of episcopacy in the sense in which he (Mr. Dodsworth) understands it." We interject this explanation, because we believe, as much as Mr. Dodsworth or any man can do, "the indefectible apostolic succession." Assuredly our ascended Lord never has, and never will, forsake his church; or fail to be with it always to the end of the world, according to his gracious promise. The leading principle elucidated in Milner's History of the Church of Christ, and the popular Protestant doctrine of "the chain of witnesses," which Mr. Maitland is so much displeased at, shews that the class of divines whom the Oxford Tracts chiefly oppose, are as strenuous in maintaining an indefectible apostolic suc-

cession, as those can be who deny that the maintenance of Scriptural doctrine has any thing to do with the question of that succession. When Milner says that the Waldenses were a link in the chain of this spiritual lineage, he vindicates the doctrine of succession as strongly as those who say that it is entirely a "visible" succession, as in the Church of Rome, and not at all dependent upon the spiritual character of any church. At this moment a controversy is going on between the British Magazine and the Record Newspaper; the former maintaining that the apostolic succession, in the visible episcopal church, is "*the only* external mark whereby to distinguish the ministers of Christ;" and that any reference to matters of doctrine in such a question is altogether absurd; for that all the alleged corruptions of the Church of Rome cannot make its priests not true ministers of Christ; and that no solemnity of Presbyterian ordination, however combined with purity of Scriptural doctrine and holiness of life, can make a pastor of the Protestant churches of Scotland, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, or France, a true minister of Christ. The Record is stated, by the British Magazine, to reply, that, in ascertaining whether a church is a true church of Christ, respect is to be had, not merely to what may be called a parchment genealogy, but to the three essential considerations of "Christian doctrine;" "Christian spirit;" and "Christian morals." We have not the paper referred to at hand to ascertain whether this threefold specification is correctly condensed; nor is it necessary, as our only purpose in alluding to the discussion is to shew that the real point under controversy is not whether Christ has always had a true church in the world, either in the dark days of Judaism, when the majority of the visible Israel bowed the knee to Baal; or in the yet darker days when the idolatrous communion of Rome made the nations of the earth drunken with her abominations, so that what professed to be the visible church was a harlot, and not the chaste spouse of Christ. This, we say, is not the point in controversy; but only the way in which the true church of Christ is perpetuated; whether the "chain of witnesses" and the notion of a true Israel of God within the pale of an outward Israel of corrupt idolaters, are ultra-Protestant fictions; and whether it be altogether an absurdity, as the Papists and divines of the Oxford Tract class say it is, to speak of a visible and an invisible or spiritual church; for that there is no such thing as an invisible or spiritual church; the true, the only church being a visible body of persons, however anti-Scriptural in doctrine or corrupt in life, who have a priesthood endowed, by means of successional transmission, with an indelible character by virtue of which they are enabled to convey justification in baptism, and to commute the eucharistic bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, without which there can be no real communion with God, no sacraments, and no covenanted mercies. There is much discrepancy in the statements of the divines in question; for while, as we have just observed, the apostolical succession, in the Romanist sense, is made "the only mark whereby to distinguish the ministers of Christ;" so that doctrine and conduct are set aside as not having any thing to do with the matter; they yet claim for the Catholic church an indefectible power of holding and transmitting the truth; or, as Mr. Newman calls it, "a supernatural gift" for that purpose; so that "the church catholic" is infallible, though particular portions of it may err;—a half-and-half, or via media, doctrine which embodies the errors and absurdities of the Romanist claim of infallibility, without its consistency; for there is some coherence in saying, that a certain church professing unity of opinion is infallible; but to say that the church catholic, which includes numerous varieties of opinion is infallible, is a contradiction in terms. The doctrine also leads to the conclusion—a conclusion which its propounders strongly urge—that much

which Protestants account Popery and not Christianity, is the voice of the real Catholic Church. This at least is consistent; for otherwise where was the "supernatural gift" during many ages before the Reformation.

We have written as above, because we know how unfairly Protestants are charged with denying the promise of Christ to his church, and snapping the chain of witnesses, just because they do not admit that "*the only*" test of a true minister of Christ is that which includes every Popish priest, while it unchurches all those Protestant churches which consider, with the council of Trent itself, (for extremes meet) that Episcopacy is not a distinct order; but that they have apostolical episcopal succession, through presbyterian ordination. We have not touched upon the question, What are the real characteristics of a genuine minister of Jesus Christ? which has been often dwelt upon in our pages, but is irrelevant to the immediate subject of our correspondent's paper. We bless God for our own inestimable privileges, as members of a truly apostolical church, without going about to judge foreign Protestant communions. It is to the word "only" that we object in the above-quoted definition; it being used in such a manner that no heterodoxy of doctrine, or wickedness of conduct, can unchurch a church, so long as it keeps up a supply of ministers by Episcopal succession. If this doctrine be true, it follows, that should the bishops, clergy, and laity of the church of any nation become Socinians, and set forth a Socinian creed and liturgy, but continue to retain the form of Episcopal ordination and government, they would still be a true church; and that secession from their ungodly communion would be schism and rebellion. Surely, then, more than this alleged "*only*" external mark, whereby to distinguish the ministers of Christ, is necessary; and accordingly our own church scripturally defines in her Nineteenth Article what are the characteristics of "the visible church of Christ;" in which definition it is very remarkable that highly as she honours Episcopacy and apostolical succession, she actually makes no mention of them; she omits the very test which the Oxford Tract divines say is "the only one;" and she exhibits that very test of Scriptural doctrine which we are told it is absurd to include even as one among others. "The visible church of Christ," says the Article, "is a congregation of faithful men, *in which the pure word of God is preached,* and the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, *in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.*" What those things are our church does not say; but the very general (and as Oxford Tract divines account them latitudinarian) qualifying words "that of necessity are requisite to the same," it is "historically known," (for we are asked to refer to history in these matters) were introduced for the express purpose of not unchurching foreign Protestant churches. The Homily for Whitsunday is still more explicit. In the passage which we are about to quote, the reader will perceive that the Romanists brought against our Reformers the very argument which Oxford Tract divines bring against their Protestant brethren; that because they do not admit the Popish notion that lineal succession is "the only" mark of a true church, but take in the "three marks" alluded to in the Article and Homily, they therefore deny that the Holy Ghost has abided with the church of Christ. "The bishops of Rome," says the Homily, "have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto (to the gift of the Holy Ghost), reasoning for themselves after this sort: The Holy Ghost, say they, was promised to the church, and never forsaketh the church. But we are the chief heads, and the principal part of the church; therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever; and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities. That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true church of Christ is; and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how

well they agree together. The true church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. And *it hath always* THREE *notes or marks* (not 'one only,' as Oxford Tract divines say,) whereby it is known:—1. *Pure and sound doctrine.* 2. The sacraments ministered according to Christ's Holy institution. And 3. The right use of discipline." "This description of the church," continues the Homily, "is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also [let the Oxford Tract divines mark this] to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers." The Homily goes on to shew that the Church of Rome lacks every one of these characteristics; and that "for the space of nine hundred years and odd" (reckoning back from the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign) "you shall perceive the state thereof to be so far from the nature of the true church, that nothing can be more." And yet during those nine hundred centuries, to which nearly three more are now to be added, the Church of Rome possessed that very mark of a true church which Oxford Tract divines account "the *only*" visible symbol; and (to come back to the particular object of our correspondent's paper) we need not remind our readers that the Church of England distinctly refers the prophecies under consideration to the Church of Rome, expressly applying to her the name of Antichrist. The bishop of Rome, says the Homily of Obedience, "ought rather to be called Antichrist, and the successor of the Scribes and Pharisees, than Christ's vicar or St. Peter's successor; seeing that not only in this point (obedience to rulers), but also in other weighty matters of Christian religion—*in matters of remission and forgiveness of sins,* and *of salvation,*—he teacheth so directly against both St. Peter, and against our Saviour Christ." And, again, in the Homily of the Peril of Idolatry, we read, in allusion to the lying wonders of Popery: "The Scriptures have, for a warning thereof, foreshewed that the Kingdom of Antichrist shall be mighty in miracles and wonders, to the strong illusion of all the reprobates." Even if we doubted whether the "thousand two hundred and three score days," were days of years, we should still see Popery plainly depicted in the prophetic page; but we do not doubt, any more than in the parallel case of Daniel's weeks, which we know were weeks of days; and what nation or writer, sacred or profane, ever used such circuitous phraseology as the above, to express three years and a half?

REPLY TO DR. PYE SMITH ON THE HISTORY OF BALAAM.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN No. 776 of "The PULPIT," there is a sermon by the Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith, *On the History of Balaam,* founded on Numbers xxii. 4, 5, in which the writer maintains the hypothesis that the narration respecting "the dumb ass speaking with man's voice," was but a dream. Dr. Smith says:

"We have now arrived at a part of the history which has given rise to much contention. From the twenty-first to the thirteenth verse, an account is given of a dialogue between Balaam and his ass: 'And Balaam rose up in the morning, and saddled his ass, and went with the princes of Moab. And when the ass saw the angel of the Lord, she fell down under Balaam; and Balaam's anger was kindled, and he smote the ass with a staff. And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass; and she said unto Balaam, What have I done unto thee, that thou hast smitten me these three times? And Balaam said unto the ass, Because thou hast mocked me. I would there were a sword in mine hand; for now would I kill thee. And the ass said unto Balaam, Am not I thine ass, upon which thou hast

ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee?' And he said, Nay.' In looking at this passage, we must make every allowance for the difference between those times and ours. I do not know any valid reason why God, in the accomplishment of His infinitely wise designs, might not employ the means here described; and miraculously impart to the ass the organs of articulation, and a knowledge of their use. After the most close and candid attention, however, which I have been able to give to the subject, I am led to the conclusion, that the occurrence here related was a *dream*, or *vision*, which took place on the night previous to his journey. He knew that he was doing wrong; for although he had permission to go, yet it was not permitted him to do so with the wicked design which he cherished in his heart—that of cursing the people. On this account his guilty conscience tormented him; and, in his sleep, vividly presented to his mind the scene here recorded. At the end of the thirty-fifth (*after* the scene is *finished*), the words 'So Balaam went with the princes of Balak,' seem to refer to his *setting out* on his journey.

"There is *one* objection which may be urged to this view of the subject, and I am aware of *only* one. The Apostle Peter says, 'The dumb ass, speaking with man's mouth, forbade the madness of the prophet.' To this it may be replied, that the occurrence, though happening only in a dream, appeared as real to the mind of the Prophet, as though it had actually taken place, and was designed to have all the force and effect of a real transaction. In *favour* of the hypothesis, the reasons are, I think, numerous and satisfactory.

"1. In the prophecies, many accounts of visions are given which are not formally introduced as such. In Isaiah there is a parallel instance:—'In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon His throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple,' &c. Here no intimation is given that the transaction was a *vision*, yet no one doubts that it was so. Reference (as in the case of Balaam) is made to it in the Gospel of John.

"2. Balaam expressed no *surprise* at being addressed by the animal. Surely so unequal an event, had it actually taken place, would not have failed to astonish the rider. His silence on the subject perfectly agrees with the phenomena of dreaming, for we then feel no surprise at the most astonishing occurrences.

"3. The narrative of this transaction appears to intimate that the Prophet was nearly alone. 'Now he was riding upon his ass, and his two servants were with him.' In his *real* journey, however, he was accompanied by the princes of Moab, who had, no doubt, a great number of attendants.

"4. He had received *permission* to go; whereas, in this account, the angel appears *angry* with him for going in compliance with that permission. This, I think, affords a strong presumptive proof, that the wakings of a guilty conscience wrought on his mind during sleep, and produced a vivid dream or vision.

"5. In the chapter following the present account, it is repeatedly said, 'He hath said which heard the words of God, which saw the *vision* of the Almighty; falling into a *trance*, but having his eyes open.' May not the passage refer to the '*vision*,' or *trance*, or *dream*, of which we have been speaking?"

There can be no question as to the authenticity of this extract; it has been for months in print and remains uncontradicted; indeed, from the phraseology and the minuteness of the headings, and still more from the special words being printed in italics, it would seem that Dr. Smith either furnished the manuscript, or inspected it, or corrected the proof-sheet; but be this as it may, there is no doubt of the arguments being his, and I shall proceed to offer some remarks upon them; first examining his "reasons," and then considering his reply to the "objection" against his theory.

First Reason. "In the prophecies, many accounts of visions are not formally introduced as such. In Isaiah there is a parallel instance:—'In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon his throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple,' &c. Here no intimation is given that the transaction was a *vision*, yet no one doubts that it was so. Reference (as in the case of Balaam) is made to it in the Gospel of John."

It is not very evident whether the word "parallel" refers to the

sentence which precedes it, or to the history of Balaam. If to the *former*, it seems to me that the words "there is an instance of this," substituted for the word "parallel," would make the sense more definite and clear. If to the *latter*, the *parallel* is far from being an exact one. Isaiah relates, as a historian, what *he himself saw*. Moses, as a historian, relates, concerning Balaam, what Balaam himself *did not see*. The evangelical prophet describes what must *necessarily* have been a dream or vision, unless he was caught up, somewhat after the manner of St. Paul, into heaven. The Jewish legislator, on the other hand, describes what must *necessarily* have taken place on the earth, and what it did not require a vision to exhibit.

"Reference," adds Dr. Smith, "as in the case of Balaam, is made to it [that is, to Isaiah's vision] in the Gospel of John." As a statement of a fact, it is true that St. John refers to Isaiah's vision, and St. Peter to the case of Balaam; but what does this prove? The proper question appears to be, What was the *specific object* of the reference? The reference of the Apostle John to Isaiah's vision was evidently designed to shew that Jesus Christ, who, as the *promised Messiah*, had just then commenced his splendid series of miracles in attestation of this important fact, was the *same Divine Person* who had been so impressively represented to Isaiah in his vision. And it may be observed, by the way, that *this reference* ought for ever to silence those who, while they profess to *believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, deny his Deity*. The object of St. Peter, in *his* reference, was to exhibit to those daring transgressors, whom he had been previously admonishing, the example of Balaam *as a warning*. But surely the Apostle did not write thus under the impression that the rebuke which Balaam received was nothing more than a dream, engendered by a guilty conscience! Assuredly he regarded it as a solemn fact, on the reality of which the efficacy of his admonition would, not only then, but in every following age, depend. A mere reference by St. Peter to the history of Balaam would have availed nothing, in the shape of proof, as to whether it was a *real transaction* or *a dream*; but the OBJECT of the reference plainly shews that it must have been a real transaction. I am now, however, anticipating another branch of this examination.

Second Reason.—"Balaam expressed no *surprise* at being addressed by the animal. Surely so unusual an event, had it actually taken place, would not have failed to astonish the rider. His silence on the subject perfectly agrees with the phenomena of dreaming, for we then feel no surprise at the most astonishing occurrences."

If, as Dr. Smith supposes, Balaam was tormented by a guilty conscience, there is the less reason to wonder that he expressed no surprise (granting that this was actually the case); for, *on that supposition*, he must have felt conscious that he was proceeding on his journey in opposition to the will of the God of Israel, of whose power, as miraculously displayed in the behalf of that nation, it is probable he had often heard; and therefore it would be more likely that he should recognize in *the miracle* the resistance of God to his criminal project, and that the feeling of *terror* thereby excited should, for the moment, absorb every other. It, however, by no means follows that because no expression of surprise is *recorded*, therefore none was *expressed*. When Eve was addressed by the Serpent she doubtless felt great amazement, yet the history makes no mention of her amazement.

The brief character of a narrative may sufficiently account for such omissions.

Third Reason.—"The narrative of this transaction appears to intimate that the prophet was nearly alone,—'Now he was riding upon his ass, and his two servants were with him.' In his *real* journey, however, he was accompanied by the princes of Moab, who had, no doubt, a great number of attendants."

Now from the 20th verse, in which the words, "If the men come to call thee, rise up and go with them," occur, we are clearly warranted to assume that the princes of Moab did not lodge with Balaam; and, for aught that appears to the contrary in the history, it might be that they abode in a different part of the town, or even, relatively to the residence of Balaam, in a *remote* part of it. It further appears from the history that Balaam *waited not* until the princes of Moab *did* "call him." It is therefore exceedingly probable that he rode from his own house to the place where he joined the princes of Moab, accompanied by his two servants *only;* and that it was during this interval that his progress was arrested by the angel. It was also to be expected, supposing a miraculous resistance was to be opposed to him, that it would take place at the *commencement* of his journey, and *before* he joined the princes of Moab; seeing that the permission he had received from God was *conditional on their first coming to call him.* The description of the locality is by no means inconsistent with the idea that the places where Balaam's progress was successively arrested lay on the skirts of the town, and there is nothing in the history contrary to the supposition that this was the preferable way from his own dwelling to the quarters of the princes.

As to the statement in the 21st verse, that "Balaam rose up on the morning, and saddled his ass, and went with the princes of Moab,"—I admit that, without looking at what follows in the narrative, it might reasonably be thence inferred that Balaam, after saddling his ass, *immediately* went with the princes; but it appears probable that the words "and went with the princes" were only designed to be generally declarative of what Balaam eventually did, and explanatory of the purpose for which he had risen up, apparently early in the morning, and saddled his ass. Our translators seem to have viewed the passage in this light, and have, accordingly, made the next verse the commencement of another paragraph. That the princes of Moab *were not with Balaam* when he *set out* on his journey, seems evident from the last clause of the following verse—"Now he was riding upon his ass, *and his two servants were with him.*" The *manner*, also, in which this information is introduced is remarkable, and seems clearly to shew that it was the design of the historian to make his readers understand exactly the circumstances in which Balaam was *at the moment* when the angel first approached for the purpose of withstanding his progress. "And the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him [now he was riding upon his ass, and his two servants were with him], and the ass saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand." Now who can doubt that the words enclosed within the brackets were inserted for the purpose above stated; and also to shew, by implication, that he had not *then* joined the princes of Moab. Dr. Smith has not brought forward the objection to which I have now replied, among his *reasons* against the usual

interpretation of the passage under consideration; and indeed he had prevented himself from doing so by including the 21st verse as a part of Balaam's supposed dream. It is very remarkable that had he *not* done so, the following awkward consequence would have resulted:—Balaam must have had his dream, *not on the preceding night*, as Dr. Smith conceives, *but after he had set out on his journey!*

Dr. Smith's remarks, that the words in the 35th verse, "*So Balaam went with the princes of Balak*, seem to refer to his *setting out* on his journey;" by which I presume he means to intimate that if Balaam really at *this time* set out, the occurrences previously related could not possibly have been real, since they imply that he had *already set out*, which would be a contradiction. I have here endeavoured to give the utmost force to Dr. Smith's remark. I reply, that the whole of its force depends upon his *taking for granted the very point to be proved*, viz., that the passage in question describes a dream. According to the usual interpretation which represents it as an account of a *real transaction*, it is plain that Balaam's going with the princes of Balak, as recorded in the 35th verse, cannot refer to his "setting out," in Dr. Smith's sense of these words, since it has been already proved that he had already *set out without them*. I may add that, according to this view of the subject, nothing could be more natural and appropriate than the language of the historian in the 35th verse—"*So* Balaam went with the princes of Moab"—as will appear from the following paraphrase; "So," notwithstanding the formidable opposition and severe rebuke he had met with from the angel of the Lord, and his own proposal to return home, yet being commanded by the angel to go, "Balaam went with the princes of Moab," i. e., he went *according* to the injunctions of the angel. Indeed, it is *only* by considering the disputed passage as an account of a *real transaction* that the force of the expression can be *properly* understood.

Fourth Reason.—"He" (i. e. Balaam) "had received *permission* to go; whereas in this account the angel appears *angry* with him for going in compliance with that permission. This, I think, affords strong presumptive proof, that the workings of a guilty conscience wrought on his mind during sleep, and produced a vivid dream or vision."

Dr. Smith here seems to have made an assumption very nearly akin to *begging the question*. I allude to the following words: "going *in compliance with that permission;*" for, surely, it may be fairly asked, 'Did Balaam really go in *compliance* with it?' On the contrary, is there not strong reason to believe that there was every thing in his going, *except* compliance with the permission God had given him? The angel, of course, did not manifest anger against Balaam without an adequate cause; and, surely, it is not difficult to discover such a cause? Can we doubt, that he set out on his journey in a temper of mind little in accordance with the spirit of his permission; that he went, not as a servant of the God of Israel, to do and to say only according to what He should speak to him; but, on the contrary, under the influence of a base and covetous disposition, and indulging a secret and impious hope that he might, eventually, be allowed to curse the people of Israel, and obtain the proffered rewards of divination; "for he loved the wages of unrighteousness." Dr. Smith himself says, that Balaam "knew that he was doing wrong; for although he had permission to go, yet it was not permitted him to do

so with the wicked design which he cherished in his heart—that of cursing the people." So that the cause of the Divine anger, notwithstanding the permission given him to go, is manifest. Besides, by violating the condition on which the permission was given, the permission *itself* was virtually cancelled. God had enjoined Balaam to wait until the princes of Moab came and called him, but he disregarded this injunction, which thus became a test, and disclosed the disobedient temper of mind in which he set out on his journey. Thus it appears that, considering the whole of the narrative in question as descriptive of a real transaction, there is nothing in it *contradictory*, although Dr. Smith seems to apprehend that there is. His inference of course falls with his premises; but it would not have stood even had his premises been sound. "This" (i. e. the *supposed contrariety*) "affords strong presumptive proof," says Dr. Smith, "that the workings of a guilty conscience wrought on his" (i. e. Balaam's) "mind during sleep, and produced a vivid dream or vision."

Now it is evident, I think, from the history, that at this very time the conscience of Balaam, instead of being *tormented*, had become *pacified*; for it thence appears that the *only* thing he had wanted, to induce him to give his consent to go with the princes of Moab, was the *permission of God*, which he had now obtained. Indeed, it seems exceedingly probable, that he was not roused to a sense of his guilt, even when the angel charged him with "perverseness;" for the only idea he immediately afterwards seems to have had of his sin was, that *he had urged his ass forward when he was withstood by the angel*; and as to this he pleads his own excuse—"And Balaam said unto the angel of the Lord, I have sinned; for I knew not that thou stoodest in the way against me; now therefore, if it displease thee, I will get me back again."

Before I pass on to the examination of the fifth and last *Reason*, I beg to suggest whether the circumstances noticed by Dr. Smith as being inconsistent with each other, might not probably be designed by God as a warning against that dangerous species of self-deception which consists in confounding what God *commands* with what he *permits*; and which so often leads men to steer their course by a regard to what they view as providential intimations, rather than by the obvious dictates of conscience and duty.

Fifth and last Reason. "In the chapter following the present account, it is repeatedly said, 'He hath said which heard the word of God, which saw the *vision* of the Almighty, falling into a *trance*, but having his eyes open.' May not this passage refer to the 'vision,' or trance, or dream, of which we have been speaking?"

Here I observe, 1. that the idea of Balaam "*falling*" into a trance, does not coincide with Dr. Smith's own supposition, that the transaction was a dream produced by the apprehensions of a guilty conscience. 2. On the supposition, that the passage in Balaam's history, under consideration, is an account of a dream, or trance, and not of a real transaction; and that he refers to this dream, or trance, in his preamble to the last of the prophecies which he delivered in the presence of Balak, he ought to have said, "falling into a trance, and having his eyes (*not open*, but) *closed*;" since it is quite evident, from the narrative, that Balaam's eyes *were not opened* UNTIL "he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand;" which, on Dr. Smith's hypothesis, would of course occur,

not at *the beginning*, but at *the end* of the prophet's dream, and consequently would be quite incompatible with the doctor's supposition of Balaam's "*falling*" into a trance. 3. It appears more fully to comport with the dignity of the occasion (for however criminal the objects of *Balak* and *Balaam* might be, the occasion, in reference to the designs of the Almighty, was a GREAT ONE), and the important prophecies of which it pleased God to make Balaam the vehicle, to suppose that he alluded to some peculiar circumstances which had attended his delivery of the preceding parables, or prophecies, rather than to a dream of his own, engendered by a guilty conscience, as Dr. Smith supposes.

So far as to Dr. Smith's *reasons* in support of the hypothesis he has espoused, which, even if admitted to be ingenious, cannot, I think, be legitimately regarded as sound. I now proceed to consider "the *objection*," and Dr. Smith's treatment of it.

The Objection. "There is *one* objection which may be urged to this (that is, Dr. Smith's) view of the subject, and I am aware of *only* one. The Apostle Peter says, 'The dumb ass, speaking with man's mouth, forbade the madness of the Prophet.' To this it may be replied, that the occurrence, though happening only in a dream, appeared as real to the mind of the Prophet, as though it had actually taken place, and was designed to have all the force and effect of a real transaction."

I shall begin with Dr. Smith's *treatment* of the objection. He represents what he supposes to be merely *a dream*, as having had a *distinctness* in the mind of Balaam equivalent to that of a *real transaction*, and he leaves others to draw the inference, viz.—that St. Peter, therefore, referred to it, *not* as a real transaction, but as a dream or vision. This I cannot admit to be a *reply* to the Objection. I now proceed to consider the *Objection itself*; and from what I have advanced, at the close of my observations on the *First Reason*, the reader will have perceived that it is an objection which cannot be so easily disposed of.

1. If *the transaction* was only a dream, the Apostle Peter must have known this; and if so, it seems a very natural inquiry, how he came to express himself as he has done on the subject; for, assuming that he wrote under the impression of the passage in question being an account of a real transaction (as I cannot doubt was actually the case), what words could he possibly have used better fitted to convey *that* impression to his readers?

2. The passage in the second Epistle of Peter, brief as it is, affords *internal evidence* that the Apostle *did* write under the impression that he was referring to a real transaction; for (1) he directs the attention of his readers to the *miraculous* features of the transaction. He does not simply say, "the ass speaking," &c.; but "the *dumb* ass speaking with *man's mouth*, forbade," &c. Such language clearly shews, that St. Peter not only regarded the passage under consideration as containing an account of a real transaction; but that he moreover designed to draw the attention of his readers, in a particular manner, to the miraculous character of it, as such. (2) The Apostle next directs the reader's attention to the *design* of the miracle; it was intended to "*withstand*" the *madness*, as well as to "*rebuke*" the iniquity, of the Prophet. The word "madness," here used by St. Peter, appropriately describes the infatuation and temerity of Balaam,

whose immoderate desire of riches seems to have rendered him utterly insensible to the foolish and criminal course he was pursuing. His conduct, indeed, exhibits a melancholy picture of what the tyrannical dominion of a wicked passion may lead to; first, as to that state of mind which is not unaptly called *moral insanity*; and, secondly, as to the *moral ruin* to which it leads. But can it be reasonably supposed, that St. Peter rested this grave and deserved imputation of *madness*, upon what merely *happened in a dream!* and that the solemn warning to the transgressors whom the Apostle was addressing, suggested by the awful example of Balaam (to which we have already adverted), rested on no better a foundation! Is all this credible?

Here I might properly terminate these remarks; but I beg to add two more considerations (selected from among several others, omitted for the sake of brevity), which appear to me to have great weight as evidence in proof of the transaction being miraculous.

1. On the supposition of the passage in question being an account of *a dream*, this difficulty arises—Wherein consisted *the difference* between Balaam's eyes *when closed*, and Balaam's eyes *when they were opened?* for the sacred historian relates, that the Lord *opened* Balaam's eyes, (vide 30th and 31st verses). Now the language there used perfectly agrees with the idea of a *real transaction*; but is altogether inapplicable to *a dream*. This difficulty, which appears in itself to be insurmountable, is greatly increased by Dr. Smith's supposition that Balaam's dream was a trance, during which he had his eyes open; for on this supposition the sacred historian is made to represent the Lord as *opening* the eyes of Balaam, *when they were already open*.

2. The manner in which the *angel of the Covenant* is introduced is very remarkable, and by no means comports with the measure of knowledge which it would be reasonable to suppose Balaam possessed relative to the God of Israel. "And the angel of the Lord said unto him (that is, to Balaam), Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times; behold I went out to withstand thee, because thy way is perverse before ME." The same observation applies to the language used by the angel in the 36th verse. "Go with the men; but only the word I shall speak unto thee, that shalt thou speak." These are nearly the exact words which God had previously spoken to Balaam, as related in the 36th verse. "And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up, and go with them; but yet the word that I shall say unto thee, that thou shalt do." Now the above identification of the angel of the Covenant with the Lord Jehovah, especially when considered in connexion with various other passages of the Old Testament of a similar description, (see particularly Gen. xviii. 1, 2, compared with chap. xxii. 15 and 16, and xxxi. 11 and 13, and Exod. iii. 2 and 4), cannot, I think, be reconciled with any other supposition than that of the passage of Balaam's history, now in question, being an account of a *real transaction*, and also that the history itself was dictated by the Holy Ghost. Were there not a single other consideration of the nature of internal evidence bearing upon the question, tending to shew the unfounded nature of the hypothesis Dr. Smith has ventured to adopt, I confess to my own mind this *alone* would be conclusive proof of its being fallacious.

In closing these remarks, I beg to observe, that we might greatly err, were we to suppose that the extraordinary miracle which has

given rise to them, was not designed by the Almighty to subserve various highly important purposes. Balaam, although a wicked man, was about to be made an instrument, in the hands of God, of communicating several important prophecies relative to his church, and the character and coming of the Messiah,—topics with which Balaam himself cannot be supposed to have had the slightest sympathy. The remarkable miracle which he had so recently witnessed—especially as it represented, proverbially, the most stupid of dumb animals, as fulfilling a Divine purpose by means of articulate and intelligible sounds, or speech,—was fitted to convey to the mind of Balaam *the principle* on which it afterwards pleased God to employ him, despicable as his character was, as an instrument in the delivery of such important and sublime predictions,—viz.: that on which he condescends to make whatever his hands have formed, however reputedly mean, or really unworthy, subservient to the accomplishment of his own inscrutable, but righteous, designs. And if Balaam, who seemed to partake of a stupidity which we might be allowed to compare to that of his own beast, did not himself profit by the humiliating lesson so seasonably exhibited to him, it cannot be questioned that the lesson itself, *assuming it to be such*, is fitted to be useful to mankind generally; inasmuch as it is adapted to check the aspirations of pride, and particularly in respect to those whom it may please God to distinguish by superior gifts of speech. To those among the primitive Christians, who were miraculously endowed with the power of speaking divers languages, not excepting even the Apostles themselves, the narrative we have been considering seems to have held out a salutary admonition; and the history of the Church at Corinth, in particular, shews that in regard to that church it was not superfluous.

A LAYMAN.

CORROBORATION OF MR. KELLY'S STATEMENT RESPECTING MR. KNOX.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In lately reading in your pages Mr. Kelly's declaration that Mr. Knox confessed to him in his last days that "his mind was not happy," that "his views had not been sufficiently evangelical," and that "he was disposed to trace the depression of his mind to that cause," I was reminded of a passage, in Mr. Knox's own letters, which strongly corroborates Mr. Kelly's statement. Not, indeed, that Mr. Kelly's word or judgment can be impeached; it is quite clear that Mr. Knox's views had not been "sufficiently evangelical;" that he had rejected, and even ridiculed, the "forensic notion," as it is called, of justification; and that he was avowedly depending upon a righteousness within him, and not upon the righteousness of Christ, for acceptance with God; and it is not to be doubted that he did express to Mr. Kelly that this pharisaical system did not yield him comfort in the prospect of death. But what is very remarkable,—or rather not remarkable at all, but a natural effect of Mr. Knox's unscriptural views, combined with a conscious feeling that they did not afford him "peace and joy in believing,"—he had long before expressed, in a postscript to one of his letters, his opinion that the doctrine of justification by faith is the true remedy—"the specific," as he justly called it—for that very depression which he described to

Mr. Kelly. He says: "I ought, perhaps, to mention, that I admit doctrinal faith, as insisted on by modern theologists, to be, in one other instance beside that stated within, the legitimate parent of feeling. I mean, where through error or ignorance there is a despair of the Divine mercy. For this malady, the truths included in the forensic system are perhaps the specific."

Here Mr. Knox stated, by anticipation, his own case in his latter days. Many causes, and not least the pertinacity—I will not say the pride—of one who had been long distinguished as the leader of a sect, might prevent his formal recantation of those opinions which he confessed had not been "sufficiently evangelical;" but in the moment of depression—when conscience was busily at work, when "doubt's galling chain" hung heavily around him, and he felt some alarms as to whether he had really led, in thought, word, and deed, that spotlessly innocent life which his friend Bishop Jebb speaks of as attainable by all baptized persons,—he saw that he must "despair of the Divine mercy" if he looked only to his own righteousness, and he was therefore glad to have recourse to simple faith in the Redeemer, whose atonement had hitherto found no place in his system, except up to the period of baptism; and he felt that "the truths included in the forensic system" were in truth "the specific" for his "malady;" in other words, according to the declaration of the Church of England, "that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

AN ANGLICAN.

ON THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM IN AMERICA.

For the Christian Observer.

MUCH is said of the success of the voluntary system, as it is called, in the United States of America. Bishop M'Ilvaine, when in England, astonished many persons with his glowing statements; and, according to his account, the transatlantic episcopal clergy receive almost universally far better incomes than the ministers of the Church of England would do, if the whole of our ecclesiastical property were agrarianised; and there are no such unfortunate beings, he said, as "half-starved clergymen." The average style of living, he remarked, was on the same scale as that of the merchants and the most favoured professional classes. There is no doubt of Bishop M'Ilvaine's veracity; but we find it difficult to reconcile his statements with facts derived from other quarters. Bishop Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, said, in a recent charge:

"The chief cause of the frequent removals of clergymen from their parishes is the total inadequacy of their maintenance. Too many of our laity permit their conscience to be satisfied with the subscription of a few dollars per annum, or the payment of a small pew-rent, for the support of their ministers: when the whole amount of the salary scarcely equals the wages and keeping of respectable labourers and mechanics, or the pay of a good clerk. I speak not of one portion of the diocese more than another. In both city and country, these discreditable facts shew the general rule, too discreditable, and by far too general. While Providence is largely blessing our commonwealth in things temporal, and increasing the ability of our lay brethren; and while the enhancement of the price of most of the necessaries of life renders the stipends of the clergy less adequate, the benefit is engrossed by the former, while the latter and their families are inconsiderately left to their embarrassments, their dispiritenings, their helpless

poverty—till, as a last resort, they leave their parishes, in the hope of getting others where they will be better provided for; though that hope proves commonly but an illusion. My brethren of the laity, 'these things ought not so to be.'"

The bishop proceeds, in a most affectionate appeal, to urge the laity to supply this grievous deficiency of voluntaryism. To the same effect Dr. Ives, bishop of North Carolina, remarks:

"It is imperiously called for, that a more comfortable provision be made for the settlement and maintenance of the Clergy. This, I know, is a delicate point, and one the discussion of which most gladly would I have avoided. But, connected as it is with the success of the Gospel among you, and urged as it is by the precepts of the Gospel, I feel that, under present circumstances, to decline it would be an abandonment of manifest and urgent duty. I know of nothing in a community, that can betoken a more alarming spirit of insensibility, than dissatisfaction and complaint in supporting the ministrations of the Gospel. What must be the state of that man, who thinks, that in the reluctant pittance he allows his minister, he pays for the words of eternal life! Who feels that, in the claims of Christian charity made upon him, the Gospel is a burden! Is this the price, dear brethren, at which you estimate the knowledge of Christ crucified? This the value you put upon his services, who is commissioned to bring you the tidings of great joy—to proclaim to you, that God in Christ is reconciling the world unto himself—to admit you into his covenant of love—to dispense to you the means of grace and the pledges of pardon and salvation—to guard you against delusion—to watch over you in temptation—to encourage you in difficulty—to solace you under trial—to stand by you in the chamber of sickness, to be to you a messenger of peace at the hour of death! O remember, Christ has said, for the encouragement of his ministers, and for the admonition of those to whom they were sent,—He that despiseth YOU, despiseth ME! But utterly unable as you are, even were you to give all your time, your talents, and your substance, to make the smallest return for the infinite blessings brought to you by the ministry of Jesus, yet, even in regard to this world's goods, a bestowment of four-fold more than you now give, would leave you greatly the gainers: gainers in reference to the value, the security, and proper enjoyment of the things you possess. But, notwithstanding this undeniable fact, that you are far more deeply indebted for worldly comfort, to your clergyman, than to any other individual in the community, still one is sometimes forced to the conclusion, that the opinion is entertained among you, that he is to perform more labour, endure more hardships, be subject to a severer scrutiny, and live upon less means, than any public functionary in the land;—that he is to bring into your service high qualifications, to be cut off from all other pursuits, to labour for you in season and out of season, stand ready to listen to your call by night or by day, to brave for your sakes the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the sickness that destroyeth at noon; and, finally, to utter no complaint, if he would avoid the charge of worldliness, though his mind be overwhelmed, and his heart torn with anxiety to discover how he is to provide even a scanty subsistence for himself and family.

"Depend upon it, dearly beloved brethren, you are not acting in this matter upon the Saviour's rule—are not doing unto others as you would have them do unto you! You demand of us that for which you are unwilling to make adequate provision! But till such provision be made, your spiritual interests must suffer! The workman is worthy of his meat; and if you refuse to give it, you cannot wonder that he should leave you for another and more encouraging field?

"Your bishop is prepared to make for you any personal sacrifice; but he cannot, as he would be just and kind, he cannot encourage his brethren of the clergy, to take the labour of any of his vacant parishes, without a reasonable assurance of their proper support.—Let me entreat you, then, dear brethren, as you would secure for yourselves the comfortable Gospel of Christ, to provide a suitable maintenance for those he has sent to preach it to you."

The bishop goes on to remonstrate against another evil in the voluntary system, that of making the clergy tenants at will of the majority of the pew-renters; which majority may not always be the most wise, the best educated, the most respectable, or, above all, the most religious part of the congregation. He writes:

"In order to give greater stability to Gospel ministrations among you, it

will be necessary to discontinue the practice, prevailing in many of our parishes, of making an annual call to a clergyman. This practice I cannot but regard as discouraging, not to say degrading, to the ministerial office; subversive of the peace and good order of a congregation, and at variance with the whole spirit of our ecclesiastical system. It is discouraging to the ministerial office. It expresses a want of confidence in a minister which is extended to every other person in society. There is something in it exceedingly mercenary and repulsive to a spiritual mind. It converts the high and solemn relation of pastor and people into a mere commercial bargain; gives to the pastoral tie, the most important that can be formed on earth, the perpetuity, in some cases, of a three month's notice!

"You say, perhaps, the practice is a matter of mere form. If so, it is certainly useless; but I clearly perceive that its being so must depend solely upon the temper of a congregation; and here, I am convinced, that its operation is subversive of peace and good order. When it is known among a people that their minister holds his situation by so slight a tenure as an annual agreement, every discontented spirit will take advantage of the circumstance, upon any imaginary cause of offence, to raise up a faction, that, at the end of the year, he may punish the temerity of the ambassador of Jesus, in his daring to be faithful. Thus the most holy and responsible office among men—that of being a co-worker with God—is often subjected to the 'cruel mercies' of the infidel and the libertine. Brethren in Christ, this ought not so to be."

We could adduce numerous passages, equally strong, from the writings of other American bishops and clergymen; but these may suffice, as a specimen of the working of the voluntary principle, even in the United States of America, and in the Episcopal church. We say even in America and in the Episcopal church; for America, be it remembered, is a new and thriving country, where land is redundant, and the necessaries and chief comforts of life are so plentiful, that it requires scarcely any sacrifice for a hundred families to provide for a clergyman; and the Episcopal communion is the most wealthy of any in proportion to its numbers; and Bishop M'Ilvaine himself always admitted that it does not afford an average specimen, for that among some other bodies of Christians the provision is often wretchedly scanty. The case of America, even if it were far more favourable to the voluntary system than it is, would not be an instance in point; for that might be sufficient (though it is not) in a rising and thinly-peopled land, which would not be so in the old and densely-populated nations of Europe, whose teeming myriads often find it difficult to procure the commonest necessaries of life. To all which it must be added, that the settlers in the United States went out with strong opinions as to the duty of setting up a national altar for God; which they did; so that what is now in progress may be rather the effects of the old solid principle, than of bare voluntaryism. Voluntary agency is of great value, as we find in England, in our schools, churches, and charities; but it is a very unsafe basis for any large and permanent measure. It may raise subscriptions for a statue, or any other object of temporary interest; but it has no enduring or conservative character; it would not even maintain the breakwater, which in a moment of zeal it had erected; and as for stemming the tide of iniquity which deluges a nation, it is almost powerless; it can do little to diffuse itself in widely-scattered populations, and less amidst the dense multitudes of large towns.

DEATH-BED OF HANNAH MORE.

For the Christian Observer.

AMIDST our various notices of our beloved and venerated friend Hannah More, we never extracted the interesting account of her death-bed, as detailed in Mr. Roberts's narrative. The reason was, that though we had marked that and numerous other passages for quotation, our very riches oppressed us; a whole Number would not have sufficed for all that we could have wished to insert; and the rapid circulation of the work almost rendered quotations at the moment superfluous. To many of our readers the passage will still be new, and those who have read it once will be glad to read it again. It is a most blessed and edifying narrative.

"It has already been observed, that as the life of Hannah More approached its termination, her thoughts often travelled to far distant scenes, and seemed sometimes to be lost in visions of eternity. The forces that kept the citadel seemed to be gradually disappearing, except those clear thoughts and holy certainties which still sustained her spirits, and suffered neither sadness nor distrust to intrude upon her last hours. Amidst all her wanderings she was coherent and consistent in whatever had an immediate relation to the place to which she was going. 'Upon one occasion,' says the faithful friend who was always about her dying bed, 'in the early part of her illness, I read to her the office for the Visitation of the Sick, and the Burial Service, in the Book of Common Prayer. She was still and engaged, while I was reading, with her hands clapsed in devotion. Some of the verses in the Psalms, after I had begun them, she would finish, exclaiming with rapture, 'how beautiful, how sweet—delighting the taste and touching the heart.' The fifty-first Psalm was continually on her lips:—'Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.'

"When the prison doors were opened, and her soul was on the point of escaping to its true home, though a thick veil was spread over the world she was leaving, no look of regret, but one of sweet sympathy with its trials and sorrows, was often cast behind her; nor could the awful change which awaited her dislodge from her heart that love of souls which had supported her through so many years of bodily suffering in her various works of Christian beneficence. Prayer was the last thing that lived in her,—every breath was prayer; and in the vital energy of her expiring petitions, her affectionate friends, and those that administered to her wants and soothed her last conflict, were earnestly recommended to the great Advocate of repentant sinners. The lady who had long taken such kind care of her, and was kneeling at the bed's side, was thus addressed by her shortly before her departure: 'I love you, my dear child, with fervency. It will be pleasant to you twenty years hence to remember that I said this on my death-bed. Be near me, and with me, as much as you can, will you? I may last out a few days—how long does the doctor think I shall live?' 'She was always,' says this lady, 'bestowing blessings on those around her, and hoping they should meet in a happier world—in an eternal and glorious world;' and when she was told of some presents made in her name to those who were employed in her service, with a smile almost amounting to a laugh, she exclaimed, 'I am glad of it—glad of it.' Adverting to her own frame of spirit, she said, 'I hope my temper is not peevish or troublesome.' And on being answered that it was the temper of an angel, she said, 'Oh no, not of an angel, but of a very highly-favoured servant of the Lord my Saviour.'

"The Psalms and other passages of Scripture were perpetually breaking from her lips, and it seemed extraordinary to those who were about her, that her memory, which had let almost every terrestrial impression slip away, had kept the registry of her devout recollections unobliterated and unimpaired. The loins of her mind were girded up, and her soul braced, as it were, to meet without amazement the strange and awful encounter which was approaching. Like one preparing for a great expedition, all impediments were thrown aside, all but the necessary implements to set up her tabernacle in the place of her destination and final rest. 'She was sometimes,' says Miss Frowd, 'painfully conscious of the disturbed and confused state of her mind. One day she put her hand to her head, and exclaimed, 'I am all confusion, I seem quite to have lost my understanding. My mind is all

so—(shaking her hand before her eyes); I used to entertain my friends and be agreeable to them. But if I shed tears, they are tears of gratitude, and from a sense of my unworthiness.'

"To save space, we lay before our Christian readers the sentences which escaped from her lips at intervals during the latter portion of her last illness, requesting them not to forget that at this period she had arrived at her eighty-ninth year. They were committed to writing by one (the survivor of the two Miss Roberts) who dearly prized her posthumous honour for the sake of the generation which has succeeded her; but whom neither this nor any other consideration could ever have induced to dress up her sentiments in any other idiom than her own. Plain as it was, it was the vehicle of her last earnest pleadings with her merciful and awful Judge.

"She said to those who surrounded her, 'Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.' 'Jesus is all in all, God of grace, God of light, God of love.' Whom have I in heaven but thee?' When very sick she said, 'What can I do? What can I *not* do with Christ? I know that my Redeemer liveth. Happy, happy are those who are expecting to be together in a better world! The thought of that world lifts the mind above itself. My God! my God! I bless thy holy name. Oh the love of Christ, the love of Christ. Mercy, Lord, is all I ask! I am never tired of prayer. Pray, pray that the dear mistress of this house may be supported in her last hours. I pray to God to forgive my many offences, to make me humble, and looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith. Lord, stablish, strengthen us!' 'The heavens declare the glory of God,"—how I love that Psalm! O eternal, immortal Lord, I prostrate myself before thee, utterly unworthy of thy mercy! Holy Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit! into thy hands I commend my unworthy self—unworthy but penitent!' Upon being asked if nothing could be done to make her more comfortable, she said, 'Nothing, but love me, and forgive me when I am impatient.' Upon her servant's proposing to read a chapter to her, she said, 'What are you going to read?' and upon being told the resurrection of Christ, she said, 'If we meet at his feet we shall be equal!' She said to her attendant, who had been repeating some Psalms and hymns, 'You cannot have your mind too much stored with these things; when you get old or are in solitude, they will supply you with comfort.' After repeating the doxology, she said to her servant, 'the word Trinity, you know, means three. I once lived in a street called Trinity-street; I do think it very wrong to give such sacred names to common things.' She often exclaimed, 'Lord have mercy upon me: Christ have mercy upon me, and make me patient under my sufferings. Take away my perverse and selfish spirit, and give me a conformity to thy will. May thy will be done in me, and by me, to thy praise and glory. I desire only to be found at the foot of the cross. Lord! I am thine, I am not my own, I am bought with a price, a precious price, even the death of the Lord Jesus Christ. Lord, have mercy upon me; grant me an abundant entrance into thy kingdom! Jesus, my Saviour and my Friend.' She talked much of the many mercies of God to her, through her very long life. To an intimate friend she said, she hoped they should meet in glory; for herself she had but one object in view, and that was to wait the Lord's time. 'Lord! strengthen my resignation to thy holy will. Lord! have mercy upon me a miserable sinner. Thou hast not left me comfortless. O Lord! strengthen me in the knowledge of my Saviour Jesus Christ, whom I love and honour. How many parts of Scripture speak of the necessity of our being born again! Raise my desires, purify my affections, sanctify my soul. To go to heaven—think what *that* is! To go to my Saviour, who died that I might live. Lord, humble me, subdue every evil temper in me. May we meet in a robe of glory: through Christ's merits alone can we be saved! Look down, O Lord, upon thy unworthy servant with eyes of compassion.' A friend said to her, 'Our good works will not save us;' she said, 'Our good works are nothing, but without them we cannot be saved.' 'You must pray for me, that my sins may be forgiven me for Christ's sake.' After repeating the 51st Psalm, she said, 'Pour out such a measure of thy grace upon me, that I may be enabled to serve thee in spirit, soul, and body; and that loving thee, I may come unto thee, through Jesus Christ. O my Saviour, forsake not her whom thou hast redeemed.' Feeling herself lingering long in her sickness, she said to a friend, 'My dear, do people never die? O glorious grave! I pray for those I love, and for those I pity and do not love.' She said, 'It pleases God to afflict me, not for his pleasure, but to do me good, to make me humble and thankful; Lord, I believe; I *do* believe with all the powers of my weak, sinful heart. Lord Jesus, look down upon me from thy holy habitation, strengthen my faith, and quicken me in my preparation! Support me in that trying hour when I most need it! It

is a glorious thing to die!' When one talked to her of her good deeds, she said, 'Talk not so vainly, I utterly cast them from me, and fall low at the foot of the cross.'

"The gradual dissolution and departure of this gentle ornament of her sex, shall be described in the natural and affecting language of the friend who cheered and comforted her last days, and her last hours, and counted the last beat of her pulse. 'During this illness of ten months, the time was past in a series of alternations between restlessness and composure, long sleeps and long wakefulness, with occasional great excitement, elevated and sunken spirits. At length nature seemed to shrink from further conflict, and the time of her deliverance drew near. On Friday, the 6th of September, 1833, we offered up the morning family devotion by her bed-side. She was silent, and apparently attentive, with her hands devoutly lifted up. From eight in the evening of this day, till nearly nine, I sat watching her. Her face was smooth and glowing. There was an unusual brightness in its expression. She smiled, and endeavouring to raise herself a little from her pillow, she reached out her arms as if catching at something, and while making this effort, she once called, 'Patty,' (the name of her last and dearest sister,) very plainly, and exclaimed, 'Joy!' In this state of quietness and inward peace she remained for about an hour. At half-past nine o'clock Dr. Carrick came. The pulse had become extremely quick and weak. At about ten, the symptoms of speedy departure could not be doubted. She fell into a dozing sleep, and slight convulsions succeeded, which seemed to be attended with no pain. She breathed softly, and looked serene. The pulse became fainter and fainter, and as quick as lightning. It was almost extinct from twelve o'clock, when the whole frame was very serene. With the exception of a sigh or a groan, there was nothing but the gentle breathing of infant sleep. Contrary to expectation she survived the night. At six o'clock on Saturday morning I sent in for Miss Roberts. She continued till ten minutes after one, when I saw the last gentle breath escape; and one more was added 'to that multitude which no man can number, who sing the praises of God and of the Lamb for ever and ever.'"

ORIGINAL POETRY.

For the Christian Observer.

FLOWERS.

FAIREST of Nature's offspring! When the mind
Has dwelt full long upon her grander forms,
The skies now bathed in light, now dark with storms—
The sea, that like a crystal zone doth bind
Earth's solid frame,—or hills which seemed designed
To prop the ethereal arch,—'tis passing sweet
Downward to glance and see ye at our feet
Nestling in quiet beauty, leaf-enshrin'd.
The mead, the hedge-row seem your fittest home;
But be it where it may, or rock's rude breast,
Or gloomy cavern, like the wreathed foam
On the vex'd billow, or the waving crest
On warrior's dinted helm, so your meek bloom
Can even terror with a charm invest.
But other spell methinks than beauty's power
Binds ye to human bosoms; ye appear
To share our moods; ye have for grief a tear
When evening bends ye 'neath her dewy shower,
For mirth a smile when morning's shining hour
Decks ye with light and gladness; on the dead
How oft your sweetest incense do ye shed,
And strew, as is most meet, the bridal bower.
Ye love the sunny brow of youth to bind,

To see gay childhood sport your haunts among,
But most when years leave childhood far behind,
In strains as "moral as the preacher's tongue,"
Ye love to raise and purify the mind,
And wean us from the world's deluding throng. R. H.

THE PASQUE ANEMONE.

(*Gerarde says that he was "moved to name" this flower thus—the Easter flower—"because of the time of its appearance."*)

NAY, in strains more than moral, witness thou
Whose very name is stor'd with memories
Of our most holy faith," high mysteries
With which are link'd man's endless bliss or woe.
Methinks for the good tidings thou dost shew
Thy silken petals, paschal flower, should wave
A happy symbol, by the Christian's grave.
For thou dost love in accents soft and low,
To lift our thoughts above "the wormy bed,"
And of the Resurrection morn to tell,
When He, on whom our sins, our griefs were laid,
Full of the Godhead,—from the grave's dark cell
Triumphant rose—the first-fruits of the dead. R. H.

PREACH THE GOSPEL.

"*Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.*"—Mark xvi. 15.

"Go, preach my word," the Saviour said,
"To every nation under heaven;
Go tell them of the Lord who bled,
Bid them believe and be forgiven;
Go quickly forth, in every clime,
The work of mercy to fulfil;
Go forth, and to the end of time
Faint not, for I am with you still."
Obedient, Lord, to thy command,
Thy servants now that word proclaim;
And babes, in many a heathen land,
Have learned to lisp their Saviour's name;
The Spirit's sword—the Spirit's power,
Can still the stubborn hearts subdue;
Thy servants, Lord, in every hour
Have found thy gracious promise true! J. E.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

REV. J. H. NEWMAN ON ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism. By J. H. NEWMAN, B.D., Fellow of Oriel College, and Vicar of Saint Mary the Virgin, Oxford. 1837.

"ENOUGH there is (says *Doctor Parr*, in his celebrated 'Spital Sermon,') and more than enough, to humble our pride and to awaken our caution, when we reflect on the errors of ingenious men in their attempts to unfold the most familiar operations of the human mind." Experience lends her voice in support of this comprehensive stricture, and superadds melancholy proofs of the proneness of

even the best of men, when devoid of chastened judgment, to commit similar errors in their investigation of revealed truths. By whatever steps, and under whatever influence of the great "Deceiver," such self-delusion has occurred, the fact must be confessed by all who are acquainted with the writings of Origen, and who mourn over his unhappy effort to blend Pagan philosophy with Christian doctrine. And as the fact is certain, so its consequences are calamitous. The mind of the self-deluded theorist undergoes a temporary eclipse, and the reader too often passes through "the disastrous twilight;" even if it be not eventually fixed in a track of unchristian speculation, which will conduct him to any point but that of substantial peace. Nor is it the least cause for lamentation, that when an author discovers his own aberration from the path of truth, it is difficult, and too often impossible, for him to bring back those whom he has misled, and to repair the evil done to those whom he may have injured in their highest, their everlasting, interests.

We wish that we could say that these remarks were not suggested to us, and we fear too appropriately, by the work before us. Painful as it is to censure where there is evidently much of deep and earnest seriousness of conviction combined with intellectual endowment, and gladly as we would decline the task could our refusal consist with fidelity to Christ and His Church, we shall now venture on a candid, but careful examination of *Mr. Newman's Lectures;* of which the professed object is (see p. 6, of Introduction) "to build what man has pulled down, in some of the questions connected with the Church; and that by means of the stores of Divine truth bequeathed to us in the works of our standard divines." Again, (p. 8) "The following Lectures ..... are chiefly written against (!) Romanism." "Their main object is to furnish an approximation, in one or two points, towards a correct theory of the duties and office of the Church Catholic."

We will not detain our readers on those points of objection and anticipation, which are found in the Preface; of "objection" on account of the assumed inattention of the present age to the writings of the early Church, and "anticipation" of much that may be argued against the theory of the author. His complaints that "we have succeeded in raising clouds which effectually hide the sun from us," and that "the true voice of Revelation has been overpowered by the more clamorous *traditions* of men," are peculiarly applicable to his own system of theology; yet he says that "the great mass of educated men are at once uneasy, impatient, and irritated ..... directly they are promised, from any quarter, some clear view of the original and Apostolic doctrine, to them unknown, on any subject of religion." If by "the mass of educated men" Mr. Newman means persons of sceptical opinions, such men are quite as much irritated by the simple humbling doctrines of the cross as by popery itself, and indeed far more so. But if he mean religious persons, their uneasiness or impatience, in reading his own pages, does not arise in consequence of their bringing us nearer to Apostolic doctrine, but because they carry us away from it, by referring us as authority to the opinions of fallible men, instead of simply to the writings of the Apostles themselves, and the other inspired penmen. It is begging the question, and in no very courteous manner, to assert that those who disapprove of his system do so because

they are impatient of Apostolic doctrine. This was to be proved, not postulated. There is nothing more "irritating" to "educated men," than this "assuming" style; though it is a powerful weapon for popular use, as the Church of Rome well knows; for the multitude are more wrought upon by vehement assertions than by proof; and we fear that we were ourselves tempted last year to be somewhat "irritated," when Mr. Newman addressed us in this very style, telling us plainly that he did not meet us on level ground to argue the question, but that he came to us with a voice of authority to settle it. His was not, he said, "a private judgment on Scripture;" he would not state his views, "as if," said he, "I did not think all other doctrines plainly wrong;" adding that this will account for "what you consider my overweening and provoking language." "I am but speaking what the Catholic fathers witnessed to be Christ's Gospel..... *The Pagans thought* the Apostles provoking!" Mr. Newman ought not to wonder that his fellow men are "impatient" when thus addressed; but so far from religious persons being indifferent to Apostolical truth, they would gladly embrace truth wherever it is found. The remark in the page following that above quoted, of their adopting "the prerogative *of being heretics,*" is baseless. The allegation, in the same page, of *personal risk* "being incurred in finding out *truth,*" might upon further consideration have been suppressed. The statement, at page 9, that "the Nineteenth Century" has *lost* "primitive truth," is mere extravagance of assertion. While we have the Scriptures, and the promised teaching of the Holy Spirit, it cannot be lost: and we bless God that there are not a few who have found it.

Having thus glanced at the Introduction, we pass on to the body of the work. There is so much of zeal for the prosperity of that Church of which Mr. Newman is himself a member and a minister, that it is impossible not to lament the failure of his enterprize in its defence. The chief error, ingrained, interwoven, incorporated with his whole treatise, is the deference to be paid to the authority of *human* writings, and the disparagement of the *sacred* records. Far as this last may be from the intentions, and even from the contemplations, of the author, it meets us in every page of his volume, and, unless we are greatly deceived, will prove noxious to his own spiritual health.

A few references to the *Lectures* will afford a sufficient warrant for these (we can truly say sorrowful) remarks. Thus, at page 34, we are informed that the Bible is not so written [query, what book is so written] as to force its meaning upon the reader; "no two Protestant sects can agree whose interpretation of the Bible is to be received." Can this assumption be reconciled with the concession at p. 36, "respecting our argumentation with sectaries," "to be willing to prove it (our creed) *solely* from the *Bible?*" Archbishop Tillotson says that "They who contradict Scripture are sure to contradict themselves." And is it not self-contradiction, first to direct us to submit (yes, even in the matter of *Anathemas*, p. 26,) to the Primitive Church, and then to admonish us to prove a religious proposition "*solely* from the *Bible?*"

But Mr. Newman soon falls back on his original and favourite position; for in p. 57 and 58 he advises certain dissentients from his own theory "to transfer their misplaced and most unrequited affection from the systems of men" [query, what were the *Fathers* but *men*] "to the one Holy Spouse of

Christ, the Church Catholic,"—a recommendation apart from any concomitant suggestion that there exists a higher authority or a more august tribunal, and which too well consists with an admission which astounded us in the same page, that "the *necessary* difference between us and them (the Romanists) is not one of essential principle;" that it is "the difference merely of superstition from religion, not of unbelief from religion." Indeed, in the 45th page the author pointedly insinuates (as he virtually does from his first to his concluding passage) that the Protestant cannot satisfactorily prove that the writings of the Apostles are "really such:" a controversial expedient which would become a subtle Romanist rather than a candid Protestant. Very reluctantly we add, that the entire publication of Mr. Newman wears such an anti-Protestant complexion (we had almost said, is so cast in the *Vatican* mould,) that we are impelled by a sense of duty to oppose it from first to last. We shall presently sustain our assertions by an appeal to unquestionable fact; and the fact is this; that in many successive pages of his work, the author labours to establish the supremacy of Primitive *Tradition*, and this in palpable contradiction of his own sentiment at page 36, as already noticed.

Before we proceed with our quotations, it may be necessary to mark a foreground which the author seems to occupy with no ordinary confidence. He affirms, in the nineteenth century, and in the face of that substantial evidence with which history confronts him, that "the principles professed by both parties (Protestant and Roman Catholic) are at once the foundation of our own theology, and of what is called an *argumentum ad hominem* in theirs!" (p. 59.) He goes on to observe, in p. 60, that "the infallibility of the Church is then found to be its first principle!" Whether by "the Church" is to be understood the Papal or the Protestant communion, its "infallibility" is its first principle!! And can this be fairly predicated of the latter Church? Is it actually come to this? Yet, if Mr. Newman's premise be correct, we, the members of an Establishment that disclaims all alliance with the polluted Papacy; we, whose forefathers protested against the infallibility in question, and who gave their bodies to the fire rather than surrender their souls to "all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" the language of whose hearts was "nothing but the Bible," and in whose never-to-be-forgotten Protests we profess honestly to join,—we, after all, maintain the same fundamental principle of "infallibility" with a Bossuet, a Bonner, and a Pope Pius!! The twentieth article of our own Church, taken in conjunction with the Homily on 'reading the Holy Scriptures,' will amply bear us out in our exclamations of grief and astonishment.

By further and more decisive quotations from Mr. Newman's work, we will shew that he practically maintains that coequality of tradition with the Sacred Scriptures, which he theoretically denies. We are sure that this denial, however inconsistent, is honest; and, indeed, he occasionally speaks with much distinctness and energy against some of the principles and practices of the Church of Rome, just as do the tracts entitled "Against Romanism," in the Oxford publications for the times; though they limit the points of difference to some non-essential matters of opinion; a few things in Romanism which need to be "reformed," but which do not warrant the strong words "protesting" and "protestant." Yet,

throughout the volume, he affirms as much in favour of tradition and antiquity as the most zealous Romanist could demand; like a soldier, who should continually, and even ignorantly, fire a battery against his own regiment, though occasionally discharging a musket against the enemy. In p. 49, for instance, when insisting on an appeal to "ancient Church history," as an arbiter in questions of theology, he observes, that "though more laborious" than a reference to the Bible, "it is a surer controversy; we are more likely to come to an end." How we are more likely to get to an end by an intricate, laborious appeal to all that has been said, done, or written during many ages, by thousands and millions of frail, fallible, inconsistent mortals, no two of whom ever thought precisely aright or alike, than by a direct appeal to one simple rule of faith, one plain inspired, unerring volume, given from on high for our instruction and correction, is not very apparent. We deny both the doctrine and the fact: the doctrine that we ought to resort to a human standard as the end of controversy, even if it were so; and the fact that it is so. Mr. Newman, indeed, says (p. 29 of Introduction) that "we are bound to consult them, (our standard writers); nay, when they agree, to follow them; but when they differ, to adjust and choose between their opinions." A Herculean task indeed, even were "standard writers" confined to the Fathers; for the works of Augustine alone are printed in seven folio volumes; and the writings of many other Fathers are numerous, massive, and expensive. How different is the inspired precept, "Search the Scriptures;" one infallible volume.

Again, at page 62, without one qualifying clause suggesting an appeal to Revelation, the lecturer says: "Both Romanists and ourselves maintain, that whatever doctrine the primitive ages unanimously attest.....is to be received as coming from the Apostles." Again, in p. 63, "Catholicity, antiquity, and consent of Fathers, is the proper evidence of the fidelity, or apostolicity, of a professed tradition." In p. 325 our author apparently outstrips himself, when he contends that "we have as little warrant for rejecting ancient consent as for rejecting Scripture itself"!!—a remarkable comment on the words which occur in a preceding page (314), "did we receive the Creed as our Gospel." In p. 85, he asseverates that "ours (our foundation) is antiquity; theirs (the Romanists) the existing Church." Can Mr. Newman really intend what he here unequivocally asserts? Is he willing to surrender the Sixth and Twentieth Articles of his own Church; Articles, by the way, which he goes far to neutralize by subjecting the Scriptures to antiquity. See p. 278 and 324. "The sole question, I say, in the Articles, is, how the Church is to teach." How can we at once build on the two separate bases of "Scripture" and "antiquity," to say nothing for the present of the confessedly unsound materials too often to be found in the latter. In p. 99 he argues to the same purport: "we have but to remain pertinaciously and immoveably fixed on the ground of antiquity; and as truth is ours, so will the victory be also;" and this too with an admission, at p. 101, that Popery "is our enemy, and will do us a mischief when she can!" Why then expose ourselves to her assaults, by making that generally exclusive appeal to the *Fathers*, which is the chief weapon that

she employs in all her contests with the Protestant. We need not adduce particular instances in proof, as we know of no discussion of this nature in which this argument has not been prominent.

At page 111 we were exposed to much of that uneasiness and impatience which Mr. Newman says persons are apt to exhibit at those clear views of Apostolic doctrine which abound in his own writings; for he has there allowed himself to affirm that "Revelation has answered some of the main obscurities of the subject (the forgiveness of sins); but has left others." The Scripture, he says, declares that "this precious atonement (of Christ) is applied to every individual in his baptism." Where such a declaration is made by any of the inspired penmen, he has omitted to inform us. And (though we shall presently attempt a *collation* of the doctrines of Mr. Newman with those of a distinguished Romanist), we must, in passing, enter our unsparing "protest" as Christians, as "Protestants," as Anglicans, against that string of insinuations which runs throughout the next page, respecting the insufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith and conduct. The insinuations can scarcely be considered free from a tinge of infidelity; a thought at which Mr. Newman would shudder equally with ourselves. For is it not one known objection of the Infidel to the writings of the New Testament, that they do not teach us some excellent virtues, such, for instance, as friendship and patriotism?—an assertion, by the way, without a shadow of proof. How does Mr. Newman construe such passages as the following? "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.) Could *more* have been said by the Apostle, to prove the adaptation of the Scriptures to every class, every condition, every circumstance, of the sons of Adam? While we insist on the necessity and the Divine institution of a ministry, to carry out the truths of Revelation into all their practical details, we cannot surrender the sufficiency of the Word of God as a guide to truth, to holiness, and to heaven; yes, even in those supposable cases, in which the reader is destitute of the important aid of exposition, and even of pastoral instruction. Though God is usually pleased to save us in the adoption of such means, He occasionally thinks fit to display the value of His own word, by making it the sole instrument of conversion and reconciliation to Himself in Christ Jesus. Here, therefore, we are again at issue with Mr. Newman.

In threading (for such it proves) the labyrinth before us, we next notice the bold observations of our author on the exercise of *private judgment*. In p. 152, he tells us that "the English Church . . . . . considers that on certain definite subjects private judgment upon the text of Scripture has been superseded, not by the mere authoritative sentence of the Church, but by its historical testimony, delivered down from the Apostles' time." In p. 174, he will find it difficult to escape from the charge of self-contradiction, (the *second* instance of it which we have had occasion to remark), as he there understands by the right of private judgment, "not that all *must*, but that all *may*, search Scripture, and determine, or prove, their creed from it—that is, provided they are duly qualified; for, I sup-

pose, this is always implied, though persons may differ" (and "*ad infinitum*" we suspect) "what the qualifications are." He is equally at variance with himself when he grants, and even demonstrates, in the 214th page, that some of the *Fathers* (the authors of that very *Tradition* which we are to consult as an oracle of truth) are in *error*. Yet, in p. 223, he startles us with the discordant observation, that we should "be cautious" in "the exercise of private judgment on the text of Scripture;" a "procedure which has led not only to Arianism, but to tenets which Protestants of every denomination will agree in condemning—Purgatory and the Pope's Supremacy"!! Here we would put it to the candour of the respected author, if, in the compass of his own observation, and that of his Protestant allies, he has met with facts to sustain the weight of this conclusion?—or is he prepared to prove, by an appeal to authentic history, that the deluded victims of the Papacy generally, or even occasionally, embraced the tenets we have just named, in consequence of *a secret perusal of the Holy Scriptures*. We may next advert to the right and profitable use of Primitive Theology, which we would advocate the practice of consulting, as an expository thesaurus, but in strict subordination to the Sacred volume. Here we take our stand. On no other principle can it be maintained, without an equal opposition to the voice of faith and reason, that we are to "*search the Scriptures;*" to "*prove* all things;" to "try the spirits;" to "call no man master;" and to pray that the Holy Spirit may "lead us into all truth." Either to the Scriptures or to the Fathers we must make our ultimate appeal. The word of *God*, or the word of *man*, must be our decisive test. There is no "via media." We would, indeed, reverence the Fathers; yet, if we once surrender the right of private judgment (however perverted or abused in certain instances), we must follow wherever they may lead, without reservation or restriction. And is this Protestantism? Assuredly not. First, let us hear what the Lord God says concerning us, and then let us consult the learned, the faithful, the able expositors of His words; but let us not give to the fallible comment an authority which is due only to the inspired text. So multifarious are the remarks of Mr. Newman on deference to Primitive antiquity, (it is in fact that centre in which the arguments employed by him, in each of his remaining Lectures, converge,) that we must necessarily pass over much that appears to us anti-Scriptural, and, we will add, anti-ecclesiastical, in his volume. Yet, we must notice an attempt made in its 334th page, to enlist *Hooker* in his cause. The memorable author of the Ecclesiastical Polity says, (Book i. sect. 14), "We do not reject them (traditions) only because they are not the Scripture, but because they are neither in Scripture, *nor can otherwise sufficiently by any reason be proved to be of God*. That which is of God, and may be evidently proved to be so, we deny not but it hath in his kind, although unwritten, yet the self-same force and authority with the written laws of God." Now, either Mr. Newman or ourselves must have greatly mistaken the import of the foregoing extract. He understands by it, that "Tradition is not ..... an uncertain mode of conveying religious truth;" whereas we collect that Hooker thought it was; since no tradition which is not "*proved* to be of God" can be of "the self-same force and authority with the written laws of God." Did Hooker

consider that Primitive Tradition is stamped with this Divine authority? Nay; for he says in the very page to which Mr. Newman directs our attention, "There is in Scripture therefore no defect, but that any man, what place or calling soever he hold in the church of God, may have thereby the light of his natural understanding so perfected, that, the one being relieved by the other, there can want no part of needful instruction unto any good work which God himself requireth," &c.; "therefore they which add traditions as a part of supernatural necessary truth, have not the truth, but are in error." We will cite a somewhat remarkable cotemporary testimony in proof that Hooker meant to exclude tradition from being "proved to be of God." Our readers will remember that a pamphlet was published in 1599, in reply to certain portions of Hooker's work, entitled, "A Christian Letter of certain English Protestants, unfeigned favourers of the present state of Religion authorized and professed in England, unto that reverend and learned man Mr. R. Hoo. requiring resolution in certain matters of doctrine, which seem to overthrow the foundation of Christian Religion, and of the Church among us, expressly contained in his five books of Ecclesiastical Policy." Dr. Wordsworth remarks in his Ecclesiastical Biography, that "this book is one of the earliest productions of those malcontents who were afterwards called doctrinal Puritans." Now we need not say that those writers, who found so many other things which they considered unsatisfactory in Hooker, would not have failed to note any dubious expression which could be construed as favouring the Romish, and opposing the Protestant, doctrine concerning tradition. Yet in remarking upon what they deemed to be an incorrectness upon another point, they incidentally shew what was his opinion upon this. They say: "Where you seem unto us, that although *you exclude traditions as a part of supernatural truth*, yet you teach that the light of nature teacheth some knowledge natural which is necessary to salvation, and that the Scripture is a supplement and making perfect of that knowledge." Here Hooker's accusers complain that it seemed to them that he made natural reason "a supplement" to the Scripture; but they do him the justice to say that he did not make traditions so. He did not admit that they were any part of "supernatural truth," as Oxford Tract divines say they are, who charged us with something very like blasphemy to God, as well as disingenuousness to our neighbour, because we spoke of Professor Keble as setting up human tradition as authority; whereas, say they, catholic tradition is *not* human, but divine, and as much to be obeyed as the written word. Hooker would have been shocked to see his words perverted as above.

There is, however, another test to which (as we have already intimated) we may subject the theology of Mr. Newman, namely, a collation of his views, relative to the sufficiency of Scripture, with those of the late Roman Catholic bishop, Dr. J. Milner, whose celebrated work, "The End of all Controversy," is of prime authority with the Papists. We might almost suppose that Mr. Newman had this work on his table, or in his recollection, and was borrowing from it. Nor can we suppress the thought which has forced itself upon us, while reading the works of Mr. Newman and his colleagues, that, were a Romanist, while contending with Protestants, generally to adopt

Protestant arguments instead of those of his own Church, as the Oxford Tract writers do those of the Papists against true Protestants, he would be not a little suspected by his own communion. Let truth and charity decide, from the following collation, how far the foregoing observation is applicable to the lecturer before us. We only premise that it is not the parallelism itself between the two authors which convicts either the one or the other of error, but the opposition manifested by both to the paramount authority of Scripture. Our quotations from Milner are from the "Rule of Faith," ed. 1830.

BISHOP MILNER.	THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN.
P. 119. "Nothing is further from the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church than to slight the Holy Scriptures."	P. 33. "All Protestant sects of the present day may be said to agree with us, and (he adds) to differ from the Romanist, in considering the Bible as the only standard of appeal in doctrinal enquiries." And p. 36, we are "willing to prove it (our Creed) solely from the Bible."
P. 130. "How are Catholics to make use of them (the Scriptures) so as to discern truth from falsehood? They must carefully observe the rule laid down at the beginning of this treatise, by the holy and learned men I referred to. THEY ARE TO INTERPRET (the capitals are Dr. Milner's) THE DIVINE TEXT ACCORDING TO THE TRADITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH."	P. 326. "Our Church adheres to a double rule, Scripture and Catholic tradition; and considers that, in all matters necessary to salvation, both safeguards are vouchsafed to us, and both the Church's judgment" (query, is not tradition "part and parcel" of the Church?) "and private judgment superseded." True, Mr. Newman adds, (what, however, forms no *essential* difference between Dr. Milner and himself) that the Romanist "rests on tradition without Scripture;" for (as we have already shewn) Mr. Newman identifies the *Creed* "with the *Gospel*." Notwithstanding, in p. 298, he pleads for that tradition which is *recorded* in the bosom of the Church itself, still he maintains, in the 297th page, that "a tradition thus formally and statedly enunciated and delivered, *from hand to hand*, is of the nature of a *written* document;" and (he adds, p. 325, which we must once more quote) "we have as little warrant for rejecting ancient consent, as for rejecting Scripture itself."
P. 123. "During the five first centuries of the Church, no less than in the subsequent ages, the unwritten word, or tradition, was held by her in *equal* estimation with the Scripture itself: and that she claimed a Divine right of propounding and explaining them both."	In p. 227. "No room is left for *private judgment*."
P. 132. "It has been demonstrated above, that they are obliged to admit of *tradition* in order to admit of Scripture itself: without this they can neither know that there are any writings at all dictated by God's inspiration, nor which, in particular, these writings are, nor what versions or publications of them are genuine."	In p. 341. "Yet allowing what force we will to them," (that is, to arguments in support of the Christian Revelation, *not* drawn from tradition) "I suppose it is undeniable, after all, that we *do* receive the New Testament in its existing shape on *tradition* . . . for instance, we include the 2nd Epistle of *St. Peter*, we leave out *St. Clement's* Epistle to the Corinthians, simply because the Church Catholic has done so."

BISHOP MILNER.

P. 96. (*How our faith is acquired.*) "Protestants are tutored, from their infancy, by the help of Catechisms and Creeds, in the system of their respective sects," &c. "Hence, when they actually read the Scripture, they fancy they see there what they have been otherwise taught to believe."

P. 110. (*On the Divinity of Jesus Christ*). "Now is it demonstratively evident, from mere *Scripture*, that Christ is God, and to be adored as such? Most modern Protestants of eminence answer, No." This is untrue, Dr. Milner.

THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

P. 290. *How our faith is acquired.* "Belief in Scripture is not the foundation of belief in the Creed. . . . . It is not true, in fact, and never will be, that the mass of serious Christians derive their faith for themselves from the Scriptures. No: they derive it from *tradition*" . . . . .

Again, p. 291. "They either do already believe it (the Bible) to be *God's* word, if they have been properly *catechized*, or they shortly will."

P. 187. (*On the Trinity and Incarnation*). "Scripture does not teach us the Trinity and the Incarnation as the Athanasian Creed teaches it; the prejudices which are too great for the one are not too great for the other." In p. 188. "Many a man insists on the words, 'Thou art Christ,' who will not go on to our Lord's answer, 'Thou art *Peter*,' &c. "Let us, then, no longer wonder at *Socinians*." And in p. 189, "Scripture was never intended to teach doctrine to the many."

Far as we are from recommending the perusal of Dr. Milner's work; and strongly as we are impressed with the conviction that a more dangerous, because more skilfully concealed, mixture of facts and falsehoods, of Scriptural doctrines and Papistical dogmas, never proceeded from the Roman "cauldron,"—still, we lament to say that the more the two writers now before us are brought into juxtaposition, the more must their similarity appear, not only in their modes of thought, but in their general phraseology. Nor are we able to discern any thing of a compensating character, even in the Thirteenth Lecture of Mr. Newman, entitled "*On Scripture as the document of proof in the early Church.*" For, though we read (p. 370) in the beginning of that Lecture, that tradition "without Scripture warrant, does not convey to us any article necessary to salvation; in other words, that it is not a rule distinct and co-ordinate, but subordinate and ministrative," we are informed, in the page following, that "we must betake ourselves to the early Church, and see how they understood it. We consider the Eucharist of perpetual obligation, because the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles thought so." Is *this*, then, the subordination of tradition to the word of God, which had just been insisted on? Are the words of *Christ* himself (Luke xxii. 19) an insufficient ground for the continual reception of that "strengthening and refreshing" sacrament?

After a full—yes, and "patient," and, we trust, dispassionate—perusal of Mr. Newman's Lectures, we are painfully persuaded that a volume more replete with error, more akin to the works of Romanism, and therefore more pregnant with injury to the cause of Protestantism, has seldom, if ever, issued from a "reformed" press. And, in proportion to the abilities, the learning, and the devoutness of the author, must be the jeopardy in which he places the theology, if not the spirituality of his admirers, more particularly of those junior members of the university of Oxford, whose ears drink in his doctrines from Sab-

bath to Sabbath. In his Lectures he so ingeniously blends truth with error, that to separate, and even to distinguish them, demands much spiritual circumspection. The direct tendency of the whole is to supplant the simple perusal of the Holy Scriptures, by means of the complicated, perplexing, and interminable study of the Fathers; a study far beyond the reach of the generality of professed Christians, and to the poor absolutely impossible. We do not mean that Mr. Newman does not urge the study of the word of God; but that the whole tendency of the system which he has adopted is to supersede it, as has been the case in the church of Rome. While quoting Bishop Milner as above, our recollections glanced back to his "Pastoral Charge" to his clergy in 1813, in which he shewed the great inconsistency of those unreflecting members of his communion, who had subscribed to the Bible Society; and as the "Bibliomania," as he called it, might, he said, soon reach his own district, he considered it his duty to lay down "a few maxims on the subject;" such as, that the church, and not the Bible, is the instrument for the conversion of mankind; that the Scriptures would lead men astray without the church's interpretation; that it were more rational "to put the Statutes at large into the hands of the illiterate vulgar, than the text of the mysterious Bible, to enable them to hammer their religion and morality out of it;" and that "a plain Catholic peasant, who is well grounded in the knowledge of his catechism, knows more of the word of God, as to the sense and substance of it, than a methodist preacher who can repeat the words of the whole Bible by heart." He added that, "the Catholic church, so far from locking it up, requires *her pastors* to study the whole of it assiduously, as being by excellence the *liber sacerdotalis*; and she moreover recommends the reading of it to all persons who have some tincture of learning, *and an adequate knowledge of* their religion, together with the necessary humility and docility to dispose them; in common with her first pastors and the pope himself, to submit their own private opinion upon all articles of faith to the belief of the Great Church." Dr. Hook, and the Oxford Tracts, and Mr. Newman, in recommending men to the study of the word of God, do so under the same restriction, of going to it, not "to hammer out their religion," but only to confirm their previous "knowledge" acquired from church tradition, and with implicit submission of what may appear to them to be taught in the Bible to "the belief of the Great Church." Dr. Milner therefore expressed his perfect confidence that his clergy would not encourage the distribution of bibles among the illiterate, but would give them such works as "the two Catechisms, the Catholic Christian Instructed, and the Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine;" it being, he says, "the exclusive business of the pastors to instruct all ranks of people, by expounding to them, *viva voce*, both scripture and tradition." And what is the Oxford Tract system but this? The Catholic church is the authority; the priest is her agent; and the people are to take "both Scripture and tradition" from his dictation. If the English clergy should be induced—which, blessed be God, we do not apprehend—to assert this anti-protestant and tyrannical prerogative; claiming dominion over men's faith, instead of being helpers of their joy, they will do well to remember that there must be two parties to a contract, and that the laity will

never again submit to such anti-apostolical Romish despotism.

Earnestly would we entreat the Christian student, in perusing such a work as that before us—or indeed any theological publication, whatever be its date, or the ability of its author, or the excellence of his personal conduct, to decide on the character and value of the doctrines maintained in it, by a reference to the only infallible authority, the sacred records. By a careful, humble, and believing examination of the latter, with constant prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we are most likely to settle the momentous question, "What is truth?" We grant, indeed, that those who adopt this mode of arriving at a right conclusion, may still be divided in their interpretation of many things in the sacred text; but their differences of opinion will not be permitted to extend to anything essential to their salvation. And we would ask, supposing they took "Catholic tradition," as it is called, for their guide, might they not be equally at issue as to the soundness, and even the import, of the exposition offered by a Father; not to mention the time required in settling the difficult preliminary of complete "agreement" among the Primitive divines. A more perilous course we cannot easily conceive, than that recommended by Mr. Newman and his allies, first to consult tradition, and then to go to the law and testimony of God. Be this fallacious rule reversed, and the voice of antiquity heard only so far as it is in strict unison with that of Revelation, the reader judging of that unison by the ear of faith, and we have no fear for the result.

We would appeal to the experience of the best expositors of Holy Writ. Again and again have they admitted that the brightest views of truth are imparted to the mind, and the deepest impressions of the "everlasting love" of Christ are made upon the heart, while we study the Scriptures in the closet, and pray that we may "hear, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them;" a prayer which can have but little place upon the principle of studying the Sacred pages only to see how they confirm what we have learned elsewhere. "Never will I admit," said *Bishop Horsley*, in his letter to Mr. King, "that our religion has in it any secret doctrine, from the hearing of which the illiterate laity are to be excluded. The notion of the incompetence of the common people to understand the whole of the revealed doctrines ..... is false and abominable. It is the very principle upon which the Sacred text was for so many ages kept under the lock and key of the dead languages." In his Sermon on the Resurrection (p. 224) he says to the same effect, "Let him never cease to pray for the illumination of that Spirit by which these books were dictated, and the whole compass of abstruse philosophy and recondite history shall furnish no argument with which the perverse will of man shall be able to shake the learned Christian's faith. [The Bishop equally applies the observation to the unlearned.] The Bible, thus studied, will, indeed, prove to be what we Protestants esteem it, a *certain* and sufficient rule of faith and practice." This testimony concerning the serious, the devout, the practical study of the Bible, is confirmed by substantial facts; for is it not the concurrent testimony of those who live to Christ, that "by Thy word I get understanding?" And who, that is familiar with the character of the pious poor, would hesitate to acknowledge the enlightening, as well as sanctifying and consoling, efficacy

of *the Bible*, apart from human exposition and human system, even in the case of those who are destitute of human learning, and incapable of such mental exercises as require much strength or great acuteness? Such students of the Sacred page are found to have acquired, or rather to have been furnished from above with, that *knowledge* of Christ Jesus the Lord, which is essential "to the saving of the soul." They are taught by the Holy Spirit, in answer to their humble prayers, how lost, how corrupt, how helpless, is every child of Adam; how entirely he owes his salvation to Him who died for the ungodly; how needful is the grace of the Holy Spirit, in transforming the heart and spiritualizing the soul of man, till he is made meet to see God. They find the Bible to be at once their rule and their support; and, while they profit by every opportunity of hearing the exposition of the word, at the mouth of its devoted ministers, still they are like the Bereans, who "searched the Scripture daily whether those things were so."

It is no small consolation to reflect on the contrast which undeniably exists between the durability of truth and the transitoriness of error. Dr. Johnson's eloquent remark—that the stream of time, which continually clears away the works of other writers, leaves unhurt the adamant of Shakspeare,—may, with far higher appropriateness, be applied to the rock of Divine truth. It remains for ever uninjured by that mighty stream, which has swept, and still sweeps, before it thousands of opposing theories, ratiocinations, and deductions; and we would gladly hope that the day will arrive, when the reverend brethren on whose opinions we have been commenting, and who, we are sure, would instantly abandon any part of their theology which they considered was proved to be unwarranted by Holy Scripture, shall discern the mistakes into which they have fallen, and be led manfully to maintain what "the mouth of the Lord has spoken." We cannot admit the doctrine of the via media, which Mr. Newman contends for; that is, a safe path between what he considers the dangerous extremes of Popery and Protestantism. Scriptural truth is too plain and unbending to allow of this compromise; as both Papists and Protestants acknowledge. As well might we suppose a middle path between knowledge and ignorance, between loyalty and rebellion, between happiness and misery. We heartily wish Mr. Newman a clear and immediate escape from his imaginary via media.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE PRAYER-BOOK AND HOMILY SOCIETY —CORONATION SERVICE.

1. *Proceedings of the Prayer-book and Homily Society during its twenty-fifth year* (1837).
2. *The Form and Order of the Service performed and Ceremonies observed in the Coronation of King William* IV. *and Queen Adelaide, Sept.* 8, 1831.
3. *Forms of Prayer and Ceremonies used at the Consecration of Churches and Churchyards; also Prayers for the Parliament.*
4. *Prayers taken from the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, arranged for Family Worship.*
5. *The Collects and Catechism.*

THE Prayer-book and Homily Society was established, just a quarter of a century ago, to circulate, without note or comment, the Prayer-book entire, and the Homilies, both entire and in separate sermons, at home and abroad, in English and in foreign languages. Last year an addition was made to the fundamental law of the Society authorizing the publication of "other forms, or portions of forms, of prayer set forth by authority." This enlargement has enabled the Society to issue the publications above mentioned; Nos. 4 and 5 being parts of the Prayer-book, and Nos. 2 and 3 being forms which the Society considers as "set forth by authority," though not included in the authorized formularies properly so called.

We have not space to review Reports of Societies, valuable though they often are; but the circumstances above-mentioned invite a few remarks; our chief object, however, being to notice the coronation service, which is connected at this moment with peculiarly interesting associations.

We have often of late heard it asked, "What need could there be for instituting the Prayer-book and Homily Society, when the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was able and willing to do all that was requisite?" The question only shews how soon historical facts are forgotten; and perhaps twenty-five years hence young persons will wonder how it was that people travelled by mail-coaches, when they might have gone so much better by railroad carriages. In the year in which the Bible Society was established, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge enumerated only about 2600 members, and distributed only 7958 Bibles and 10,520 Testaments. The Bible Society originated in the inability or unwillingness of the Christian Knowledge Society to supply an edition of Welsh Bibles; which led to the question whether an institution might not be formed for circulating the Holy Scriptures without comment, and also without test or ballot as in the Christian Knowledge Society, so as to include the aid of all who were favourable to the diffusion of the Sacred Oracles, though they might not concur in many other matters. So far back as 1787 the most strenuous and continued applications had been made to the Christian Knowledge Society to print some Welsh Bibles. The Society had at that period a portion left of an old edition, which it husbanded so parsimoniously, that a London clergyman, who had negociated the matter for nearly twelve months, at length addressed his Welsh correspondent: "I have delayed so long to write, in hopes of sending you some tidings about the Welsh Bibles; but, alas! I have waited only for a disappointment." He had applied with money in his hand, chiefly supplied by the liberality of Mr. Thornton; but "the Society," he adds, "refuses to part with more than 500, and those at a price which altogether makes 5s. 6d. each." Only five hundred would the Society spare, though the applicants brought money in their hands; whereas Dr. Gaskin himself was obliged to confess, a few years afterwards, that 40,000 would not meet the demand; and time has proved that hundreds of thousands were not sufficient. Thus affairs went on for ten long years; the clergy and the poor loudly complaining that "Bibles were not to be had for money." At length the demand became so urgent, that a memorial was drawn up and signed largely throughout the Principality, assuring the Society of the dearth, and imploring help. In

consequence of these demands, the Society was induced in 1792 to promise to print 10,000 copies; but only on the condition that the applicants should give security to pay for 4000, as soon as they were printed; which was agreed to; but even then, the Society was "so dilatory, indecisive, and reluctant," (see the printed correspondence), that it was not till the year 1796 that the order was issued by the Board, nor was it till 1799 that it was executed. Thirty years had now elapsed since an edition of the Welsh bible had been printed, and the thirst was so great, that the edition was instantly bought up; no applicant could get the number he had requested for circulation; in considerable districts not a single copy could be purchased; the people went many miles to procure the treasure; and, it is added, "the joy of those who succeeded amounted to exultation; the grief of those who could not obtain a copy fell little short of anguish." In 1800 the demand became so urgent, that the Society was entreated to print another edition, but in vain. "For more than two years," says Mr. Owen, "the disappointed candidates for Welsh bibles, among whom were many diligent and laborious parish ministers, persevered in the mortifying business of importunate but unavailing application." The Society distinctly stated, that "no further help was to be expected from them now; they gave a decided refusal more than twice." It was not till the summer of 1802, when all prospect of relief from the Society was closed, that the project was determined upon, of printing an edition by private subscription; but when the case came to be examined into, it was found that the dearth was not peculiar to Wales; many parts of England were equally destitute; and in no one town or village were there bibles adequate to the wants of the people; and then came also into review the still greater necessities of other nations, and the claims of the heathen, and the importance of translating the Scriptures into various tongues, in only a comparatively small number of which had they hitherto appeared; and hence originated the British and Foreign Bible Society. If it be said that the reluctance displayed by the Christian Knowledge Society arose from the circumstance that the management of its concerns was monopolised by a few individuals, who considered the clerical applicants, and their lay friends, the Wilberforces, Thorntons, Teignmouths, H. Mores, and so forth, as an obnoxious sect, which ought not to be aided in distributing Bibles, it cannot be fairly said that this objection, if true, ought to have weighed with the proscribed parties. When Lord Teignmouth communicated to Dr. Gaskin, the secretary, in the most courteous manner, the intelligence of the formation of the Bible Society—adding that "the communication is dictated by that respect and esteem which the committee cannot but feel for a society which has so long and successfully exerted itself in disseminating the knowledge of Divine truth,"—even the receipt of his Lordship's letter was not so much as acknowledged; yet when a complaint was made by a Welsh clergyman that the orthography of the Bible Society's Welsh Bible, printed under sanction of the Syndics of the Cambridge press, from the Oxford edition of 1799, was exceptionable, the new society was so far recognised, that Dr. Gaskin was directed by the Board to send the complainant's letter—not to Lord Teignmouth, its president,

or to the secretaries, or the committee—but personally to all those bishops who were members of the new society. To complete the transaction, when the Bible Society set about printing the Welsh Bible, the old society began printing an edition also; and the whole course of the proceedings, from first to last, shewed that there was more of party-spirit than of zeal in the transaction.

These allusions to the circumstances which gave rise to the Bible Society, were necessary, in order to explain the origin of the Prayer-book and Homily Society. The enlarged circulation of the Holy Scriptures by the Bible Society, soon caused a large demand for the Formularies of the Church of England; Mr. Seeley, who was the publisher to the Bible Society, stated that since he had sold Bibles for that institution, his sale of Prayer-books had increased four-fold; and the demand upon the Christian Knowledge Society was also doubled; but however great had been the urgency, if the spirit and proceedings of the Society had been at that period what they are now—though still further improvement is needed—the Prayer-Book and Homily Society would not have been formed. What were the facts of the case? 1. There was a large number of clergymen and laymen who could not conscientiously subscribe to circulate the exceptionable tracts which formed the majority of those then on the Christian Knowledge list; and their opinion has been subsequently corroborated by the proceedings of the society's own revisors. 2. There were some excellent clergymen and laymen who were anxious to be members, but who were blackballed; among whom was Mr. Simeon, a very large distributor of Prayer-books, but who was obliged to get them from the booksellers at a heavy charge. His friend, Mr. Wilberforce, had happily been admitted to membership many years before; and some other equally obnoxious individual had also passed the ordeal, when their names were not much known; but the terrors of the ballot-box were now in full force; and though the actual rejections might not be very numerous, yet—and this leads us to cause 3—great numbers of those clergymen and laymen whose opinions were displeasing to the party which ruled the society, declined being put in nomination; among whom were some of the most active and attached members of the Church of England, who were thus precluded from procuring Prayer-books through the Society; more especially as the Society would not allow its books to be sold to any but members, who alone were permitted to circulate them. 4. Great numbers of pious and zealous Churchmen could not afford to become members; for the party which ruled the institution, wishing to keep it, as they said, "select," refused to lower the terms of admission, which were two guineas entrance, besides the annual subscription. 5. The Society did not circulate the whole of the Formularies of the Church of England. If its present prayer-books are not redundant in having the Thirty-nine Articles bound up with them, the great majority of the old ones were imperfect; and when clergymen specially applied for copies with the Articles, for the use of their schools or parishes, they were informed that it was not customary to bind up the Articles with cheap copies for popular circulation. But the most important omission—or, rather, determined rejection—was in the case of the Homilies; which the So-

ciety refused to print. This admirable volume of discourses, the authorised and never enough to be valued exposition of the doctrines of the Church of England, had well-nigh vanished from the land. It was very rarely to be met with, except in public libraries; the laity in general knew nothing of the book, and very few of the clergy possessed a copy; and though the canon directs that it shall be kept in every church, the injunction was disobeyed. Nor was this merely accidental; for many of those divines whose opinions prevailed in the Society, wrote and spoke with much hostility of the Homilies. Professor Marsh, among many others, strongly censured those who made the poor acquainted with them; their doctrine was decried as Calvinistic and fanatical; and though it was admitted that the clergy ought to read them, and accordingly the Society at length admitted the volume upon its list, it continued to refuse to print them in separate sermons or tracts, which was the only way in which they could be popularly circulated. 6. We might mention various other causes; one of which was, that the Christian Knowledge Society did not adapt itself, even as regarded Prayer-books or its own tracts, to various cases of extreme exigence. The very year in which the Prayer-Book and Homily Society was formed, a most pressing application was made, through members in London, from the Governor of Senegal, for some Bibles and Prayer-books, for a garrison of three hundred men in that pestiferous climate, almost all of whom had been taken from the hulks or Newgate; but the request was refused, on the ground that the Society had not been accustomed to extend its aid to the army; besides which, its funds, it was added, were very low. The applicants hereupon applied to the Bible Society for Bibles, and obtained them; and therefore only asked the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to supply a few Prayer-books; but this also was refused.

Under circumstances like these, there was ample cause for the institution of the Prayer-Book and Homily Society; and it was peculiarly hard upon members of the Church to be taunted with belonging to a Society which distributed Bibles without Prayer-books, and yet to be black-balled at the Christian Knowledge Society, so that they could not procure them without forming a new institution. Some of the present members cannot believe that such a spirit so recently prevailed; but no one doubted it at the time to which we are referring. In the very first anniversary sermon of the Prayer-Book and Homily Society, Mr. Cunningham significantly mentioned, as a peculiar excellence of its constitution, that "it neither has a ballot nor needs any; its security is the fixed character of the works which it distributes." In our reply, in 1812, to Dr. Marsh's objections to the Prayer-Book and Homily Society, in which he said that all who were friendly to the distribution of the Prayer-book should join the Christian Knowledge Society, we asked: "But will he receive them? Has he proposed Mr. Simeon to that Society, and has he been accepted? Does he mean to say that every person who may wish to distribute Prayer-books will be admitted into the pale of that Society without the risk of being black-balled?" The contrary was notorious. The ballot, as at present exercised, is a proper safe-guard; and is quite necessary in a Society which issues tracts, and allows every member to vote (a privilege which we trust

will always continue), but at that time it was an instrument of party oppression.

But the question occurs, Is the Prayer-book and Homily Society still necessary under the improved habits of the old Society? It is certainly not so necessary as it was when it was founded; but we discern many reasons for not abandoning it. It is the only institution which distributes nothing but the authorised Formularies of the Church of England; and its aid is still welcome to those Churchmen (for such there are) who feel scruples about joining the Christian Knowledge Society, on account of some of its tracts. It also embraces some objects not proposed by the elder Society, particularly in its highly-valuable practical operations among seamen; besides which, having but one line of action, it can devote more time and energy to it, especially in regard to foreign translation, than an institution which has multifarious objects. It does no harm to the Christian Knowledge Society, whose funds it has incidentally been the means of largely increasing, as the Bible Society was before it: for such is human nature, that two societies will often flourish together, when one alone would go to sleep. There is not at present the least jealousy, or cause for jealousy, between the two institutions. The very last Report of the Prayer-Book and Homily Society contains truly cordial and honourable letters from the secretary of the Christian Knowledge Society, and from its most Reverend President and the Bishop of London, returning thanks for copies of its foreign publications. But the time may come even yet, when the services of the younger Society may be again needed in a way in which happily it is not at this moment. It is not long since Dr. Pusey presented himself before the Committee of the Christian Knowledge Institution, to remonstrate against sending the Church of England Prayer-book to Roman Catholic countries, without the sanction of the Popish bishops; on the ground that they are the legitimate successors of the Apostles; and that to circulate our Prayer-books (how much more our obnoxious Homilies!) among their flocks is a breach of the union of Christ's holy catholic church. It may be said that those who reason thus are at present in a minority in the Church and the Society; but they boast that their members are increasing; and even very recently they assembled at the board in a strong body, and after a warm debate, and several amendments and divisions, carried a motion which unchurched the Church of Scotland. Their distaste for the Homilies is well known; their powerful ally, the late Bishop Jebb, did all he could, both in person and by press, to prevent their circulation; and not a few divines confess, that though they subscribe the words of the Article which says that the Homilies contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine," and necessary for the times in which they were set forth, yet that this declaration is only general; that the book abounds with most exceptionable statements; such as that the Church of Rome is Antichrist; that it is altogether unfit for the present times; and that though the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is justified in keeping the volume on its list for the use of the clergy, yet that to sell the discourses separately as tracts, so that they may fall into the hands of the people, is a proceeding much to be deprecated. Now when we remember that it is only of late years that the Society has been conducted with reasonable fairness and candour towards

those who wished to reform its proceedings; that it is only recently that it has even disclosed the names of the Standing Committee who conduct its affairs; and that at this moment a proposition is before the Society for depriving the members of the right of balloting for tracts, which, if it should be adopted, would consign the management of this important part of the Society's concerns into the hands of a very few individuals, some of whom may have a strong opinion of the inexpediency of continuing to print the Homilies as tracts, or circulating the English Liturgy in Roman Catholic countries—there can be no harm, and may be much good, in having a second Society which specially includes these objects among its fundamental rules. As to the notion, that because one Society exists, any other which embraces a portion of its objects is an interloper and a rival, we cannot for a moment entertain it. The world of sin and misery is wide enough, and far too wide, for all; and each is strengthened, rather than weakened, by the labours of its benevolent neighbour.

But, even if all these reasons were less weighty than they are, there is yet another consideration which induces us to think that the Prayer-book and Homily Society cannot be spared, namely, that it embraces one important object not contemplated by the Christian Knowledge Society: namely, the translation of the Homilies into foreign languages. Those who have read the Reports of the Prayer-Book and Homily Society must have observed, that this is one of its most interesting important departments. It has translated many of the Homilies into the Irish, Welsh, Manks, French, Spanish, Italian, German, Portuguese, Indo-Portuguese, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Modern Greek, Russian, Turkish, Arabic, Armenian, Bengalee, Hindoostanee, and Chinese languages; whereas the foreign-translation department of the Christian Knowledge Society is confined to the Liturgy; it does not include the Homilies; nor has the Society ever printed or circulated a single Homily in any foreign language, (we do not include five in Welsh), or expressed any intention of doing so. The labours, therefore, of the Prayer-book and Homily Society cannot be dispensed with, and they ought to be strenuously supported.

Last year, as we have before stated, this Society's object was enlarged, and we confess that our opinion went fully to the extent of that enlargement; but we perceive considerable difficulties in working it out, as the moment we quit the Prayer-Book and Homilies, there must be considerable latitude of opinion respecting what has the sanction of authority, or what is the authority that can sanction. The Society has issued what it calls, "THE Form of Prayer and Ceremonies used at the Consecration of Churches;" but it is only one of many forms, for any bishop may use what form he pleases, and there is no reason why the form used in one diocese should be called THE form; indeed we see much inconvenience in thus giving national circulation to what is only of diocesan application. The form published by the Society, is, we believe, that used by the present bishop of London, and this should have been stated on the title-page. Henceforth, as it will circulate beyond its official limits, it may be called, for distinction sake, the Prayer-Book and Homily Society's form; but we protest against any Society's thus setting up a general standard, and this without any intimation that the text

which it has selected has not the slightest claim to general authority. We had recently occasion (see our Number for January, page 18) to lament the discrepancies of the forms in use; and to suggest the importance of all the bishops agreeing to adopt one text, (though it would be only a conventional arrangement, as no bishop would be bound by it, if he saw fit to prefer any other form;) but we cannot consent that any society should take this office upon itself. If the Prayer-Book and Homily Society would use its influence for bringing the matter under the mature consideration of the bench of bishops, with a view to have the various forms in use collated, and one standard text agreed upon, it would do good service to the church; but it ought not to publish as "*the*" form what is only "*a*" form. We may take an opportunity, in some future Number, of giving a few historical details relative to our Services for the consecration of churches and church-yards. If the Society publishes any form in the present state of the text, it ought to give that which was agreed upon in Convocation, and not the edition of any particular bishop.

The Coronation Service is printed by the Society exactly in the way which we have suggested for the service for the consecration of churches; that is, with due specification of time and place, and not as a general form. It is in substance a very ancient service, but has been officially revised by each successive king or queen in council. It is in many respects an admirable service; and since the Reformation it has been purified from the superstitions of popery, which ran throughout it; though it still retains more of ceremonial than perhaps quite accords with Protestant simplicity. But its excellence is in its devoutness; its unction; its constant recognition of Christianity in its connexion with civil government; its faithful and scriptural exhibition of the respective duties of rulers and subjects grounded upon the inspired declaration "By Me kings reign," and this blended with its thorough constitutionalism in its application to the particular form of polity, secular and ecclesiastical, which it has pleased God to establish in this realm. It consists of the following parts: The entrance into the Church; The Recognition; The First Oblation; The Litany; The beginning of the Communion Service; The Sermon; The Oath; The Anointing; The presenting of the Spurs and Sword, and the Oblation of the said Sword; The investing with the Royal Robe, and the Delivery of the Orb; The investiture per Annulum and Baculum; The putting on of the Crown; The presenting of the Holy Bible; The Benediction, and Te Deum; The Inthronization; The Homage; The Communion; The final Prayers, and The Recess.

We will now extract a somewhat ample portion of its contents; and we most earnestly hope, that in any revision which may take place for the approaching national solemnity, the utmost jealousy will be exercised that there shall be no change which can in any wise impair its scriptural character. Indeed we could wish, that instead of being an *ad libitum* office; from reign to reign, it were revised once for all by due ecclesiastical authority, with the concurrence of the crown, and then set forth by Act of Parliament, as the fixed form for all future occasions. We observe, that at the very first rubric in the copy before us, under the word

"altar," is inserted a note telling us to read "communion table;" and it were desirable that the whole service were in this particular rendered conformable to the prayer-book; for though a word is of no great consequence where the meaning is clear, and nothing exceptionable is intended, yet it was not without sufficient cause that the pious and judicious revisors of our Liturgy declined inserting a term which they well knew might lead to great mistakes in doctrine.

"In the morning, upon the day of the Coronation, early care is to be taken that the Ampulla be filled with oil, and, together with the spoon, be laid ready upon the altar in the Abbey-church. The King and Queen, as soon as they enter at the west door of the church, are to be received with the following anthem, to be sung by the Choir of Westminster. Anthem. Psal. cxxii. 1. 5. 6. 7.

"The King and Queen in the mean time pass up through the body of the church, into, and through the choir, and so up the stairs to the theatre; and having passed by their thrones, they make their humble adoration, and then kneeling at the faldstools set for them before their chairs, use some short private prayers; and, after sitting down (not in their thrones, but in their chairs before, and below, their thrones), there repose themselves.

"The King and Queen being so placed, the archbishop turneth to the east part of the theatre, and after, together with the lord chancellor, lord great chamberlain, lord high constable and earl marshal (garter king of arms preceding them), goes to the other three sides of the theatre in this order, South, West, and North, and at every of the four sides, with a loud voice, speaks to the people: and the King in the mean time standing up by his chair, turns and shews himself unto the people at every of the four sides of the theatre, as the archbishop is at every of them, and while he speaks thus to the people:

"Sirs, I here present unto you King William the Fourth, the undoubted King of this realm: wherefore all you who are come this day to do your homage, are you willing to do the same?

"The people signify their willingness and joy, by loud and repeated acclamations, all with one voice crying out,

"God save King William the Fourth.

"Then the trumpets sound. The Archbishop goeth down, and before the altar puts on his cope; then goeth and standeth on the North side of it: And the bishops who are to read the Litany, do also vest themselves. And the officers of the wardrobe, &c. spread carpets and cushions on the floor and steps of the altar. And here, first the bible, paten, and cup are to be brought and placed upon the altar. Which being done, the king, supported by the two bishops, of Durham, and Bath and Wells, and attended, as always, by the dean of Westminster, the lords that carry the regalia going before him, goes down to the altar, and kneeling upon the steps of it makes his first oblation, uncovered; which is a pall or altar-cloth of gold, delivered by the master of the great wardrobe to the lord great chamberlain, and by him, kneeling, to his Majesty: and an ingot or wedge gold of a pound weight, which the treasurer of the household delivers to the lord great chamberlain, and he to his majesty, kneeling: who being uncovered delivers them to the archbishop, and the archbishop standing (in which posture he is to receive all other oblations) receives from him, one after another, the pall to be reverently laid upon the altar, and the gold to be received into the bason, and with the like reverence put upon the altar.

"Then the Queen ariseth from her chair, and being likewise supported by two bishops, and the lords which carry her regalia going before her, goeth down to the altar, and kneeling upon the cushions there laid for her, on the left hand of the king's, maketh her oblation, which is a pall, to be received also by the archbishop, and laid upon the altar. Then the archbishop saith this prayer, the king and queen still kneeling:

"O God, who dwellest in the high and holy place, with them also who are of an humble spirit, look down mercifully upon these thy servants, William our King, and Adelaide our Queen, here humbling themselves before thee at thy footstool, and graciously receive these oblations, which in humble acknowledgments of thy sovereignty over all, and of thy great bounty to them in particular, they have now offered up unto thee, through Jesus Christ our only mediator and advocate. Amen.

"The King and Queen having thus offered, and so fulfilled his commandment, who said, 'Thou shalt not appear before the Lord thy God empty;' go to their chairs set for them on the South

side of the altar, where they are to kneel at their faldstools when the Litany begins. In the mean time, the lords who carry the regalia, except those who carry the swords, come in order near to the altar, and present every one what he carries to the archbishop, who delivers them to the Dean of Westminster, to be by him placed upon the altar, and then retire to the places and seats appointed for them.

"Then followeth the Litany, to be read by two bishops, vested in copes, and kneeling at a faldstool above the steps of the theatre, on the middle of the East side thereof, the choir reading the responses. A sanctus. Then the archbishop beginneth the Communion service.

"The Epistle—1 Pet. ii. 13. To be read by one of the bishops. The Gospel—S. Matth. xxii. 15. To be read by another bishop; the King and Queen with the people standing.

"At the end of the Creed one of the bishops is ready in the pulpit, placed against the pillar at the north-east corner of the theatre, and begins the sermon, which is to be short, and suitable to the great occasion; which the King and Queen hear sitting in their respective chairs on the south side of the altar, over against the pulpit. And whereas the King was uncovered during the offering and service following; when the sermon begins, he puts on his cap of crimson velvet, turned up with ermines, and so continues to the end of it. On his right hand stands the bishop of Durham, and beyond him, on the same side, the lords that carry the swords: on his left hand the bishop of Bath and Wells, and the lord great chamberlain. The two bishops that support the Queen are to stand on either hand of her. And the lady that bears up the train, and her assistants, constantly attend her Majesty during the whole solemnity. On the north side of the altar sits the archbishop in a purple velvet chair; the bishops being placed on forms along the north side of the wall, betwixt him and the pulpit. Near the archbishop stands garter king at arms: on the south side, east of the King's chair, nearer to the altar, stand the dean of Westminster, the rest of the bishops who bear any part in the church service, and the prebendaries of of Westminster.

"The sermon being ended, and his Majesty having, on Tuesday the 2d day of November, 1830, in the presence of the two Houses of Parliament, made and signed the declaration, the Archbishop goeth to the King, and standing before him, administers the Coronation Oath, first asking the King,

"Sir, Is your Majesty willing to take the oath? And the King answering, I am willing, the Archbishop minister eth these questions; and the King, having a copy of the printed form and order of the Coronation Service in his hands, answers each question severally, as follows:—

"*Archb.* Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging, according to the statutes in parliament agreed on, and the respective laws and customs of the same?

"*King.* I solemnly promise so to do.

"*Archb.* Will you to your power cause law and justice, in mercy, to be executed in all your judgments.

"*King.* I will.

"*Archb.* Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? And will you maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established within England and Ireland, and territories thereunto belonging? And will you preserve unto the bishops and clergy of England and Ireland, and to the churches there committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges, as by law do, or shall appertain to them, or any of them?

"*King.* All this I promise to do.

"Then the King arising out of his chair, supported as before, and assisted by the lord great chamberlain, the sword of state being carried before him, shall go to the altar, and there being uncovered, make his solemn oath in the sight of all the people, to observe the premisses: laying his right hand upon the holy Gospel in the great Bible, which was before carried in the procession, and is now brought from the altar by the archbishop, and tendered to him as he kneels upon the steps, saying these words: The things which I have here before promised, I will perform and keep—so help me God. Then the King kisseth the book, and signeth the oath. The King having thus taken his oath, returns again to his chair; and both he and the Queen kneeling at their faldstools, the archbishop beginneth the hymn *Veni, Creator Spiritus*, and the choir singeth it out.

"This being ended, the Archbishop saith this prayer:

"O Lord, Holy Father, who by anointing with oil didst of old make and consecrate kings, priests, and prophets, to teach and govern thy people Israel:

bless and sanctify thy chosen servant William, who by our office and ministry is now to be anointed with this oil (here the archbishop lays his hand upon the *ampulla*), and consecrated King of this realm: strengthen him, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter; confirm and stablish him with thy free and princely Spirit, the Spirit of wisdom and government, the Spirit of council and ghostly strength, the Spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and fill him, O Lord, with the Spirit of thy holy fear, now and for ever. *Amen.*

"This prayer being ended, the choir sing: Anthem. 1 Kings i. 39, 40.

"In the mean time, the King rising from his devotions, having been disrobed of his crimson robes, and having taken off his cap of state, goes before the altar, supported and attended as before. The King sits down in his chair placed in the midst of the area over against the altar, with a faldstool before it, wherein he is to be anointed. Four knights of the garter hold over him a rich pall of silk, or cloth of gold; the dean of Westminster taking the ampulla and spoon from off the altar, holdeth them ready, pouring some of the holy oil into the spoon, and with it the Archbishop anointeth the King, in the form of a cross: on the crown of the head and on the palms of both the hands, saying,

"Be thou anointed with holy oil, as kings, priests, and prophets were anointed: and as Solomon was anointed king by Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet; so be you anointed, blessed, and consecrated king over this people, whom the Lord your God hath given you to rule and govern, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

"Then the dean of Westminster layeth the ampulla and spoon upon the altar, and the King kneeleth down at the faldstool, and the archbishop standing on the north side of the altar, saith this prayer or blessing over him:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who by his Father was anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, by his holy anointing pour down upon your head and heart the blessing of the Holy Ghost, and prosper the works of your hands: that by the assistance of his heavenly grace you may preserve the people committed to your charge in wealth, peace, and godliness; and after a long and glorious course of ruling this temporal kingdom wisely, justly, and religiously, you may at last be made partaker of an eternal kingdom, through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"This prayer being ended, the King arises, and sits down again in his chair, when the Dean of Westminster will invest his Majesty with the super-tunica."

We have thus extracted the whole service to the conclusion of the anointing. We will now add several of the prayers which follow during the remainder of the solemnity. They are peculiarly beautiful and appropriate.

"Receive this imperial robe and orb, and the Lord your God endue you with knowledge and wisdom, with majesty and with power from on high; the Lord cloath you with the robe of righteousness, and with the garments of salvation. And when you see this orb set under the cross, remember that the whole world is subject to the power and empire of Christ our Redeemer. For He is the Prince of the kings of the earth; King of kings, and Lord of lords: so that no man can reign happily, who derives not his authority from Him, and directs not all his actions according to His laws."

"Receive this ring, the ensign of kingly dignity, and of defence of the Catholic faith; and as you are this day solemnly invested in the government of this earthly kingdom, so may you be sealed with that spirit of promise, which is the earnest of an heavenly inheritance, and reign with Him who is the blessed and only potentate, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

"The archbishop, standing before the altar, taketh the crown into his hands, and laying it again before him upon the altar, saith;

"O God, who crownest thy faithful servants with mercy and loving-kindness; Look down upon this thy servant William our King, who now in lowly devotion boweth his head to thy Divine Majesty; and as thou dost this day set a crown of pure gold upon his head, so enrich his royal heart with thy heavenly grace; and crown him with all princely virtues, which may adorn the high station wherein thou hast placed him, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

"Then the King sitting down in King Edward's chair, the archbishop, assisted with other bishops, comes from the altar; the dean of Westminster brings the crown, and the archbishop, taking it of him, reverently putteth it upon the King's head. At the sight whereof the people, with loud and repeated shouts, cry, God save the King;

and the trumpets sound, and by a signal given, the great guns at the tower are shot off. The noise ceasing, the archbishop goeth on, and saith,

"Be strong and of a good courage: observe the Commandments of God, and walk in His holy ways: fight the good fight of faith, and lay hold on eternal life; that in this world you may be crowned with success and honour, and when you have finished your course, receive a crown of righteousness, which God the Righteous Judge shall give you in that day. Amen."

"*The presenting of the Holy Bible.*

"Our gracious King; we present you with this book, the most valuable thing that this world affords. Here is wisdom: this is the royal law; these are the lively oracles of God. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this book; that keep, and do, the things contained in it. For these are the words of eternal life, able to make you wise and happy in this world, nay wise unto salvation, and so happy for evermore, through faith which is in Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

"*The Inthronization.*

"The Te Deum being ended, the King is lifted up into his throne by the archbishop and bishops, and other peers of the kingdom, and being inthronized, or placed therein, all the great officers, those that bear the swords and the sceptres, and the rest of the nobles, stand round about the steps of the throne, and the archbishop, standing before the King, saith:

"Stand firm, and hold fast from henceforth the seat and state of royal and imperial dignity which is this day delivered unto you in the Name and by the authority of Almighty God, and by the hands of us the bishops and servants of God, though unworthy: and as you see us approach nearer to God's altar, so vouchsafe the more graciously to continue to us your royal favour and protection. And the Lord God Almighty, whose ministers we are, and the stewards of his mysteries, establish your throne in righteousness, that it may stand fast for evermore, like as the sun before him, and as the faithful witness in heaven. Amen."

The homage then follows; the archbishops and bishops first swearing allegiance, and kissing the king's left cheek; and afterwards the lay peers. Their majesties then receive the holy communion; preceded by the archbishop, the Dean of Westminster, and those bishops who have officiated on the occasion.

Such is the august and devout national spectacle which is about to be exhibited among us; and the anticipations of which we fervently trust will call forth many ardent supplications from all who know the value of prayer, on behalf of that illustrious and beloved youthful sovereign whom God has placed upon the throne of these realms. She needs in a very peculiar manner the intercessions of her subjects; for most arduous is her station, and great beyond those of ordinary life are the difficulties and dangers which surround her. In the very useful little manual of prayers from the Liturgy issued by the Prayer-Book and Homily Society for family worship, there is one daily for the Queen; and the one for Wednesday evening, taken from the service for the Accession, is eminently seasonable. To a youthful mind the pomps and vanities of the world have a charm of novelty which renders them peculiarly dangerous; and who can say how fearfully perilous must be their attraction in the case of one suddenly called in tender years from almost the seclusion of private life, to encounter all that refinement, and splendour, and adulation can heap together to delight the eye and captivate the heart. It is a giddy eminence; and steady must be the head that does not become dizzy as the eye glances downward from such a precipice. Let us pray that the blossoms of hope be not withered by courtly influences more blighting to the severe virtues of the Christian life than the nipping blasts of the rudest poverty. It is the grace of God deeply engrafted in the heart, which alone, whether in the sunshine of prosperity or the winter of adversity, can cause hallowed fruits to ripen in a hu-

man bosom; and blessed be God that grace, as it is needed in the most favourable stations, is also sufficient for the most arduous. Few only possess the hazardous responsibility of being able, in a direct manner, to bring the doctrines and precepts of the Bible to bear upon the habits of a princely circle; but all who desire it can have access to a higher than any earthly throne; and let those who value that inestimable privilege remember, for their consolation, that it were one of the brightest omens for our beloved Queen, that she should be a queen of many prayers.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE recess of Parliament for the Easter holidays has postponed the business of legislation. The hope expressed in our last Number, that the detestable Hippodrome Bill, which has called forth the indignant remonstrances of all who love religion, order, or decency, would be thrown out, has unhappily not been realised. To the disgrace of the House of Commons, the Bill has passed its walls; but happily for the national morality there is another court of appeal; and we cannot doubt that the House of Lords will reject the measure with disgust; and thus prevent the outrage upon our youthful sovereign of such an abomination being brought before her for signature; notwithstanding some of her domestic advisers have so little understood the sacredness of their responsibility, as to take her to visit the site of this scene of turpitude, apparently with a view to give an appearance of royal sanction to the Bill; as if because all was green, peaceful, and uncontaminated when her Majesty was present on a blank day, it is not a focus of most portentous evil when thrown open for horse-racing, gambling, and their concomitant enormities. Her Majesty, we grieve to say, appears to have some about her whose councils are not the most wise; and greatly does she need influential advisers, who would faithfully represent to her how mistaken is the notion that a British sovereign wins any solid and valuable popularity by countenancing the theatre and opera, or lightly regarding the strictest sanctions of the day of sacred rest. With what pain do vast numbers of her Majesty's most faithful, affectionate, and devoted subjects, read from time to time such announcements as the following in the public newspapers:—"We rejoice to state, that in consequence of the enlightened patronage of our gracious and amiable Queen, theatrical property, which was lately at a discount and nearly bankrupt, is generally improving; and we deceive ourselves if the present reign, in spite of our modern puritans, does not prove the golden age of elegant taste and polished fascination." Again: (Monday, April 9th. Passion week!) "The Queen honoured the performance of the opera Lucia di Lammermoor, on Saturday evening, with her presence. Her Majesty attended divine service yesterday morning at St. James's palace. The Archbishop of Canterbury preached. The anthem was 'Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?'" Alas, what different sounds to those of the opera a few hours before! The radical and infidel portion of the newspapers have been boasting that the Archbishop of Canterbury is in disgrace at court, and that he was contumeliously thrust down from his rightful station at the royal table, because the Queen was afraid of his giving her some good advice, especially as to the importance of the due observance of the Christian Sabbath. The story, like a thousand others, is mere apocryphal rumour; and no man who considers the judiciousness and delicacy which characterize his Grace's mind and habits will believe that he would obtrude his monitions without the most scrupulous regard to all the decorums of time, place, and circumstance; or that if he felt it his duty to offer any suggestion to his sovereign, he would do it publicly at the royal board. But the tale serves to shew the jealousy of those who so exultingly relate it, lest the feelings and opinions of the more serious part of her majesty's faithful subjects should obtain too much influence over her royal mind. Hitherto her reign has been almost one continued ovation: and an affectionate and loyal people are preparing to pour forth the full tide of their grateful homage at the approaching great national solemnity; but should days of disappointment come,

as they have even in the most popular and prosperous reigns, it will be the solid virtues of the sovereign, and not the frivolous shouts of a theatre, which will be, under God, the stability of the British throne.

In default of Parliamentary intelligence, several of the newspapers have been busying themselves about the affairs of the Christian Knowledge Society, in consequence of a most unwise and inoperative resolution passed last month, "that no person be at liberty to publish or supply to any newspaper, or other periodical work, reports of the discussions which take place at the meetings of this Board." Was ever a rule of a Society so worded? "That no person be at liberty;" there is conscious impotence in the very phraseology; the asserting that he is not at liberty is a proof that he is; and the Society might as well decree that the wind shall not be at liberty to blow, or the sun to shine. It has power to say that no member shall use pen, ink, paper, or pencil, in that room; though such a resolution would be absurd and tyrannical; and even if it passed it would not prevent members carrying away in their memory the substance of the proceedings, and reporting it as they pleased, though with the disadvantage of unwritten recollections; but the Society has no right to decree what any member shall "be at liberty" to do, or not to do, out of that room. Why not say that no member shall speak of the Society's business to his friend, or allude to it in a letter; for this would not be a more arbitrary act of assumption than to say that he shall not publish, or supply to a newspaper, any statement of the proceedings. It is unwise to decree what you have no power to enforce.

But it is replied, that the resolution is not intended to bind the members by power, but only in honour. The effect, if we may judge from our own feelings, is precisely the reverse. The writer of these remarks has been a member of the Society, and the conductor of a periodical publication, for not many years short of a quarter of a century; but he has always abstained from giving reports of the speeches at the Board; not because he considered that the Society has any right to restrain the pens of its members, but from a reluctance to note down, print, or circulate, words spoken in brotherly conference, and which the speakers did not intend or wish to go forth as a printed document; added also to a doubt as to whether it is not best to confine reports to the doings of the Society rather than to embrace its monthly talkings. We have, however, no wish to judge for others; we speak only the impression of an individual; and are quite willing to allow that this view of the case may be morbid, unsound, or squeamish; and that those who report the speeches for the John Bull, or the Standard, or the St. James's Chronicle, or the Record, act on principles more enlarged, wise, liberal, and useful. But even upon our own view, how stands the matter when what an individual does upon principle as regards utility, or duty, or delicacy, —or be it squeamishness, or what you will—is attempted to be enforced upon him by a majority, with hot speeches, and musterings, and outcries to drown the voices of the minority, and a shew of hands, and a division right and left, after the manner of secular assemblies? Why, at sight of such proceedings the question of honour becomes a question of law; it is no longer what it was said to be, "a matter of Christian or gentlemanly understanding," (though, as Christian gentlemen are divided in their views on the subject, non-reporting is not more Christian or gentlemanly than reporting), but it is a mere question of strength; "You shall not be at liberty to do what you think most wise, just, delicate, or useful; but shall be tied down by a rule which you consider ill-judged, unfair, and not binding upon you, since it does not relate to your conduct in that room but out of it, and is irrelevant to the business of the institution, which has nothing whatever to do with newspapers, and magazines, and reporters; but ought to go on doing its duty, whatever men may think, or say, or print of its proceedings. The very first result of this effort to enforce by a law what was merely a matter of personal discretion, is that, instead of Mr. Clarke's solitary statement, there appears in the Record newspaper an elaborate report of the last meeting of nearly eight columns, drawn up by twenty-two members, who have prefixed their names to it, protesting against the decision of the Society as unwarrantable in itself, and as carried by clamour, not argument. Five other newspapers also, we understand, have also reported the proceedings; and John Bull, whose notices some of the members were formerly much pleased with, says: "It appears that the proceedings at the meeting of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, holden on Tuesday, were not only unlike anything we were led to anticipate, but unlike anything ever attempted by any Society constituted

and embodied as that Society is. It now is converted, oddly enough, on the motion of a gentleman called Tyler, into a sort of lodge of Freemasons. Nothing can be more absurd than the resolution that 7,000 people shall keep a secret—nothing more injurious to the Society than the proposition. We shall, of course, publish a copious report of the May meeting, in spite of the mischievous and absurd attempt at stifling the truth."

We have not offered any opinion as to the propriety or impropriety of reporting the speeches; but only as to the impropriety and inutility of attempting to prevent it. Even in our Number for February 1835, when we complained of some misreports in the Record newspaper, while we were quite ignorant who was the reporter, we said, "We have neither the right nor the wish to interfere with the conductors of any other publication who may have conscientiously arrived at a different conclusion from ourselves; and never in a single instance have the pages of the Christian Observer alluded, directly or indirectly, to the reports of the Christian Knowledge Society's proceedings in the Record." Our complaint even then was not against reporting, but misreporting, and we considered we had just cause for complaint; for the statements in some instances were not the words or ideas of the speaker, but the reporter's comment upon them. The reports since that period have been much fuller, and we feel confident that Mr. Clarke has conscientiously endeavoured to state fairly the meaning of the speakers, and he has succeeded far beyond what could have been anticipated. The circumstances of the Society also have considerably changed. About that very time the writer of these remarks, wishing to circulate privately among the officers and leading members a memorial, printed but not published, suggesting several of those measures, commercial and literary, which have since been adopted, applied for a list of the Standing Committee, in order to send his paper to them; but was informed that their names could not be communicated, though he gave a pledge that no other use whatever should be made of the list, and that no copy should be given or shewn. The Secretaries obligingly offered to give the memorial to them, but were not at liberty to grant their names; nor would they even communicate those of the auditors of the accounts. The meetings also were comparatively small, and there was an avoidance of publicity in the whole proceeding. The affairs of the Society are now much more public; the names of its officers are prefixed to its Reports; the Monthly Board has become a large meeting; and not only the Record, but other newspapers, frequently report its proceedings: and though considerable inconveniences have resulted from this, yet there have been countervailing benefits; but be this as it may, it is unwise for the Society to attempt to prevent the practice; and doubly unwise to chafe itself about it. There would have been reports long ago, in one form or another, if the public had been sufficiently interested in the proceedings of the Society to demand them; let us rejoice that this interest is now excited; let us thank Mr. Clarke and the Record for their share in exciting it; let the members speak only what is worth reporting, and leave the newspapers to take their own course.

The Rev. Dr. Chalmers is delivering in London, to a large and highly influential auditory, a most powerful, and but for the solemnity of the subject we should say splendid, course of Lectures upon National Church Establishments. It were utterly in vain to attempt any analysis or outline; and we rejoice to say that the attempt is unnecessary, as the Lectures will be published immediately upon the conclusion of the course.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. M. H.; Zenas; Luther; J.; Kingstoniensis; A Friend; C. E. P.; W. S.; A. A. O.; H. H.; T. D. A.; C. C.; E. F. P.; Emma; M. J.; A District Society Member; and J. H.; are under consideration.

It is lamentably true, as Rusticus says, that "the fine arts" may be made an instrument of public demoralization; and that the most jealous vigilance should be exercised over national institutions for their encouragement, lest they should corrupt—we mean morally—the taste of the people; but we fear that in pages like ours, such a specification as he alludes to, would be improper. The Society for the Suppression of Vice might do well to consider the subject.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 6. JUNE. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE ASCENSION.—(St. Luke xxiv. 49—53.)

For the Christian Observer,

THE period of the ecclesiastical year at which we have now arrived, invites our attention to the close of the Gospel history, and to the last scene of our Blessed Lord's sojourn upon earth. It has been observed, that there was no witness who beheld Him at the moment of His rising from the tomb, because the fact of His resurrection could be amply verified by the testimony of those who saw and conversed with Him subsequently to his crucifixion,—by those who, as the Apostle expresses it, did eat and drink with Him after he rose from the dead. But as none can behold Him in that glory in which He is now enthroned,—as none can penetrate into that inaccessible light in which He now dwells, until they have stript off the veil of flesh, and, their time of probation expired, have entered upon that fixed, eternal state from which no traveller returns, it was graciously provided of God, that competent witnesses of so important a fact should behold our Lord in the very act of His ascension from earth to heaven. These witnesses were the eleven Apostles, whom He had chosen to be the first preachers of the Gospel, and witnesses of all things which they had seen and heard; chosen before of God to be witnesses of His resurrection; and doubtless for this cause, that as their intimate converse with our Blessed Lord, for three years and a half previous to His death, precluded the possibility that they could be themselves deceived in His person, so their subsequent lives gave the most abundant proof that they could not have combined to deceive others: because while they met, everywhere, persecution and contempt for the name of Christ, and themselves recorded the prophetic declaration of their Divine Master that such should be their lot, even unto death; that as the world had persecuted Him, it would persecute them also; yea, that the time would come when he who killed them would think that he did God service; yet they were ready to stake all, for time and for eternity, upon the cause of Christ, as those who looked, "not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen;" who knew well the interest, and could trust the Master whom they served; and looked beyond this earth, and these visible heavens, for the recompence of the reward. After our Lord had com-

municated to these His last promise, "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you:" and issued His last command, "But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high," "He led them out as far as to Bethany."

Bethany, which our Lord selected as the place of His ascension, was the scene of many interesting and important events in the history of His life of humiliation. It was the place of His frequent and favorite retirement from the din and bustle of Jerusalem: and its very name Bethany—that is, "the house of sorrow"—indicated it as a suitable abode of Him who "was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." Here dwelt Martha, and Mary, and Lazarus, whom "Jesus loved;" and to whose hospitable roof He often retreated to refresh His wearied spirit, vexed and harassed by the frivolous and perverse disputings of the Scribes and Pharisees; by the contradiction of sinners, and the malice and hostility of unprovoked adversaries; there to enjoy a peaceful evening, such as His gentle spirit loved, in holy converse with this pious family: while they "sat at Jesus' feet, and heard His word," and hung, with mingled affection and reverence, upon "the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth." Here too was that garden whither Jesus ofttimes was wont to resort—the private oratory, the only closet of Him who, though He created the heavens and the earth, had "not where to lay His head." Here He often poured out His soul in sweet and devout communion with His Heavenly Father; and passed, in prayer, those hours of repose which He could steal from a life devoted to the duties of active benevolence: and, after days of controversy in the temple, or passed in the more pleasing, though not less exhausting, labours of love, "continued all night in prayer to God." It was at "Bethphage and Bethany on the Mount of Olives" that He lately commenced His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, heralded by the acclamations of a fickle multitude, who, in a few short days, exchanged those "Hosannahs" for yells of execration, "Crucify Him, Crucify Him." Here too was Gethsemane, where he endured that mysterious agony of soul, which with strong crying and tears He deprecated, and which wrung from his meek and patient spirit that bitter though submissive cry, "O my Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt." Here was the cheek of the Holy Jesus profaned by the traitor's kiss! Here were the hands of the Omnipotent bound with cords by His own rebellious creatures! This was the spot, associated with so many painful and tender recollections, which our Lord selected as that on which He would cast off, for ever, the garment of heaviness and humiliation; and ascend to resume those robes of glory, and that crown and sceptre of dominion, of which for a brief moment He divested Himself, that He might come among us in great humility,—that by His suffering obedience He might "magnify the law and make it honourable," and then, ascending the altar of the cross, might make a full atonement for the sins of a guilty world, and purchase the Spirit of life, and peace, and holiness; and thus, by the joint operation of his atoning sacrifice and sanctifying Spirit, might expiate all our sins, and cleanse us from all our iniquities. Here it was that He would plant his last parting footsteps on earth; and here, if His second advent be in person, He will plant His first returning steps: for, if His advent be personal, assuredly this particular respecting it is distinctly stated by Zechariah, when he says, "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives,

which is before Jerusalem on the east;" "and the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one."

The circumstances, too, of our Lord's departure were eminently calculated, not only to console His bereaved disciples, but, throughout all ages, to cheer and encourage His spiritual church, of which these Apostles, now depurated from the traitor, were the representatives. Were we to consider only the reception which our Lord met, when he condescended to visit this apostate world—this rebellious province of His universal empire: that when "He came unto his own, his own received him not:" that from his cradle in a manger, to his death-bed on a cross, He was passed over with the most contemptuous neglect, or persecuted with active hatred: that his countless miracles of mercy were returned by the basest ingratitude: and that, at length, He closed a life of privation, contempt, and sorrow, by a cruel and ignominious death upon the cross:—were we to consider all this, we might well fear lest his departure should be marked with every token of disgust and aversion; and lest his visit to earth, designed in mercy, should yet prove a curse, and serve, eventually, but to seal and enhance our condemnation.

Even the Apostles themselves might have justly feared lest they too should be included in this judgment. Peter, who denied his master; Thomas, who dared to prescribe the terms on which he would credit his resurrection; the three disciples, who practically refused to watch with Him one hour, and who slept during their Saviour's agony; all the disciples, who "forsook Him and fled," might well fear that when that presence was withdrawn, which hitherto had been their shield and their exceeding great reward, it would be withdrawn in judgment, not in mercy—not because it was expedient for them that He should go away, but because his long-suffering patience had been worn out by their manifold provocations. How consoling then to the disciples—how cheering to His people in every age—that, just as he was about to quit this apostate and ungrateful world; just as He was about to place himself at the head of the battalions of the heavenly host, and ascending up on high to lead captivity captive, conqueror over sin and death; just as the angelic choir were about to tune their golden harps, that they might hail, with anthems of praise and joy, the return of their adored and recovered Lord; and to sing the Psalmist's triumphal song, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in;" just as the first rays of Divine glory burst forth from the manifested God, His last act should be an act of affectionate solicitude for His disciples,—His last accents the accents of love and blessing! "He lifted up His hands and blessed them." As the High Priest once every year entered into the holiest with the blood of the atoning sacrifice, and returned, with uplifted hands, to bless redeemed Israel; so did our Great High Priest, when, by the one offering of himself, as a Lamb without blemish and without spot, He had made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, with uplifted hands, bless His people. When this Divine Ambassador from heaven to earth, charged with a message of peace from God to man, was about to return to Him that sent him, he returned, proclaiming that God was reconciled to man, and that, through the blood of His cross, God may

now be just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly—"the justifier of him who," deeply feeling that he has no righteousness of his own to plead, no strength on which to rely for pardon of the guilt, and relief from the misery, and deliverance from the bondage of sin, "believeth on Jesus."

"And it came to pass that *while* He blessed them He was parted from them." Not as though the blessing were incomplete; not as though the near view of His own glories obliterated from the heart of Jesus his sorrowing disciples, and hurried him away, while the blessing hung, yet unfinished, upon his lips: but He was parted from them in the act of blessing, to indicate that the work of blessing still continues: to point out the office which, as our advocate with the Father, He still discharges in the courts above: and that as He "died for our sins, and rose again for our justification," and ascended up on high, leading captivity captive, that He might receive gifts for man, so "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." He has indeed ascended the throne of heaven, and there sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high. But He sits there as "a Priest upon his throne," and ever pleads the cause of His believing people. And when the Divine justice, and truth, and holiness—for these attributes, not the heart of God, are arrayed in hostility against the guilty—claim the forfeited life of the transgressor against that strict and holy law which pronounces, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them;"—*He* intercedes for man: and, lifting up His hands—those hands pierced by the nails that fastened Him to the accursed tree—that He may demonstrate to the congregated host of heaven that God's holiness has not been compromised by the pardon of guilty man, but that the law has been "magnified and made honourable;" that "mercy and truth have here met together, righteousness and peace embraced each other," He pleads his own atoning righteousness, and sufferings, and death;—exclaims, 'Place the guilt of his transgressions to my account; lay upon me, as the scape-goat of an apostate world, the burden and penalty of all his sins; and let this penitent believer—this prisoner of hope—this purchase of my cross—this child of adoption and of my love,—let him go free!'

But full as was our Lord's bosom of affectionate solicitude for His disciples, yet "He was parted from them." And we may, in some degree, conceive the bereavement, not only of comforts but of privileges, which such a separation must have caused; and at such a time, when they had to confront the rage and malice of a persecuting world, and were, as yet, unstrengthened by the influences of the promised Comforter—were not yet "endued with power from on high." And let us here pause to reflect upon the uncertain tenure by which we too hold all our blessings—not only our temporal comforts, but our spiritual privileges. Let those to whom God has vouchsafed the inestimable blessing of pious parents, or Christian friends, or zealous ministers, remember that these means of grace are lent to them, not given: that these all, sooner or later, must be "parted from them, and carried up into heaven:" and let them so avail themselves of those blessed privileges—so practically know this day of their visitation—that, when the time of their own departure comes, they too may follow them thither. Let them so discharge the duties of every relation, natural or providential, here below, that when this relation is

dissolved, whether by death, or by whatever dispensation of Providence, they may not have cause to look back with remorse upon opportunities neglected, and privileges abused: or to reflect with bitter anguish, when it is too late to repair the wrong, that their conduct has often sent back the efforts of love, sharpened into keen arrows of disappointment, and poisoned by their ingratitude, into bosoms now lying in the cold and silent grave, but which, while they beat at all, beat, for them, with generous and unselfish affection.

As our Lord ascended from their view the disciples prostrated themselves in adoration. "They worshipped Him:" And this worship unreproved—these Divine honours accepted from the representatives, the embryo of the infant church, prove Christ to be very God: and doubtless were permitted, or rather received, to justify us in "honoring the Son, even as we honor the Father." Contrast with this the conduct of Paul and Barnabas to the people of Lystra—or the conduct of Peter to Cornelius, when he would prostrate himself before him, "Stand up, I myself also am a man;" and, in this accepted adoration of the Apostles, let the Socinian, while he acknowledges the holiness of Christ, acknowledge also that Christ was more than man. Contrast the conduct of this angel, God's direct ambassador, to John, when he fell at his feet to worship him; "See thou do it not. I am thy fellow servant; and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God," and let the Arian see that Christ is not merely an angelic existence,—a creature, though the first of created beings, but very God. Observe the rapid haste, the hurried brevity, with which both the Apostle and the angel interrupt this act of adoration, strongly expressive of the horror with which they contemplated this impious profanation, this shocking blasphemy. Observe oo the angel's argument and motive for the rejection—"Worship God;" namely, that none but God should be the subject of such adoration as was now offered to him by the Apostle;—and in the rejection of such worship by the holy Apostle, while opening the kingdom of heaven to the Gentile world—and still more by the holy angel, while yet the odours of heaven breathed freshly from this ambassador from the courts above, and the rays of Divine glory, imparted by the recent converse of God, still emanated from him—and, in the acceptance of this worship by Christ, let us see that great, that vital, and vitalizing truth, that Christ is, as Scripture expressly asserts him to be, "God over all, blessed for evermore."

This act of adoration performed, "they returned to Jerusalem, with great joy." Jerusalem was the scene of their greatest danger, the forefront of the enemy's battle: yet those, heretofore, timid disciples returned thither, undismayed, because they returned in obedience to the commands, and awaiting the promises of a master whom they now, knew to be Divine—nor merely undismayed, but "with great joy." When, but a short time before, our Lord announced to them His intended departure, "sorrow," He himself tells us, "filled their hearts." The dreaded event occurs, and their hearts are filled, not with sorrow, but "with great joy." And here, before we ask the cause of this amazing change of spirit, let us pause to observe how faithful a copy it furnishes of our own frequent experience: how convincing a proof of the vanity of human hopes and fears. I am deeply convinced that far the greater portion of the miseries of life is

derived, not from actual but anticipated evil—evil which never arrives; or, if it does arrive, is converted into blessing. Some cloud rises in the horizon, and threatens to darken our course through life. We torment ourselves with anxious fears and foreboding alarms for the gloom and desolation in which it will involve our prospects; and when we have suffered, in protracted anxiety, far more than the dreaded ill could itself inflict, the cloud passes over innocuous, or bursts in refreshing showers upon our heads: while in some other quarter of the heavens the gathering vapour again threatens—for it is not God's purpose that we should find repose on earth—and again alarms, unless experience and grace have taught us to interpose the shield of faith: or perhaps some unexpected shock warns us that our confidence and our happiness should be centred in God alone. Our Lord teaches, not the rule of stern duty, but the secret of true happiness, when He tells us to "take no thought for the morrow, but to let the morrow take thought for the things of itself." He knew what the lot of man must necessarily be in this school of discipline, this sinful and troublesome world. He knew too, by experience, how vulnerable and sensitive is the human heart; and that we need not, by anticipation, to accumulate sorrows; that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Our wisdom, in every untoward event of life, is this—faithfully to inquire what duty summons us to perform; and this done with diligence and prudence, (and it will not be done the less effectively because the judgment of the head has been unimpeded by the distractions of the heart), our privilege is to commit the event to God: to cast all our care upon a God who careth for us: whose prerogative it is, and His alone, to extract good from evil: and whose promise it is that "all things"—however hostile in their nature—shall "work together for good to them that love Him." Let us but learn to put our hearts into that petition which God himself has taught us daily to offer, "Thy will be done;" and we are in a certain sense one with God, and God with us, by sympathy in that which is the essence of a moral being, the will: and, amid all the fluctuations of created things, we may repose in the one centre of unity and rest —the bosom of the all-wise, all-gracious, and all-directing God.

The source of the Apostle's joy, St. Luke, in the last words of his Gospel, reveals: they "were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." And surely "it is a good and pleasant thing to be thankful." Surely a spirit of thankfulness is a spirit of rejoicing. Surely the services of God's temple, and the praises of God's name, are the best—the only effectual, antidote to the cares of this world. Our Lord had declared to the disciples, "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." They knew that the promises of God were designed, not to supersede the need of means, but to stimulate to greater zeal and diligence in the use of them; and therefore, while waiting the fulfilment of His promise, they would be found in the way of His commandments. We too, especially if we be made partakers of redeeming and sanctifying grace, should feel ourselves charged with the obligation of showing "forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light." We should study to reflect that light from a pure heart, and by a holy conversation, upon them that now sit in darkness and in the

shadow of death, that we may guide their feet into the way of peace. Thus should we "let our light so shine before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our Father which is in heaven."

Let me not conclude these observations on our Lord's ascension into the heavens, without reminding the reader of that day when He shall come again to judgment, and "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ:" that great and terrible day of the Lord, when, as St. Peter tells, "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up:" and of which a Greater than Peter, even our Lord himself, speaks in these awful words: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send His angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Sometimes, when I have witnessed an eclipse of the sun, when I have seen the face of heaven, slowly but steadily, gathering blackness, through the operation of an ordinary law of nature, my mind has been naturally led to think upon that total eclipse of which our Lord here speaks, when "the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven;" and which will wrap in unmitigated gloom the created universe—except those who have light in themselves; whose souls are illumined by the felt presence of God. And if this partial obscuration of our sun, which we witness as an ordinary phenomenon of nature, be calculated—and surely it is calculated—to inspire feelings of solemn reverence for the great Creator and Upholder of all things in every rightly constituted mind, how infinitely more awful must that feeling be, when the eclipse of created lights is not partial but total—the effect, not of a natural, but of a supernatural cause: when that voice which said, "Let there be light; and there was light;" and thus commanded the sun to shine out of darkness, and burst in meridian glory upon the glooms of midnight, shall again command darkness palpable, in the twinkling of an eye, to quench the lustre of the mid-day sun, and wrap the world in primeval gloom: when the Omnipotent Hand, which created, shall again take asunder the curious mechanism of creation, "and the stars shall fall from heaven" in wild confusion, "and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken:" and, in the flames of an universal conflagration, all shall perish, except those who are impregnated with the indestructible and saving principles of holiness, faith, and love. And who shall abide this day of His coming? Who shall stand when God thus appeareth? Assuredly those alone who have fled, in time, for refuge to the hope set before them in the Gospel of Christ; who "know in whom they have believed, and are persuaded that He is able to keep that which they have committed to Him until that day." Assuredly those only will so meet it, who, "justified by faith, have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and who have received the Spirit of adoption which cries Abba, Father, and witnesses with their spirits that they are the children of God: those only who are sealed with the Spirit

of holiness, the signet with which God stamps and separates unto Himself a peculiar people, even here below. It is true that "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," but unto them only "that look for him, shall He appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." It was to the disciples, "while they looked stedfastly toward heaven" after the ascended Saviour, and whose hearts and affections ascended with Him, that the angelic attendants proclaimed, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven:"—shall *so* come, in the attitude and voice of love; with tender affection in His heart, and blessings on his tongue. *So*—in *like manner*—

> Jesus again descendeth from on high;
> With blessings on His lips—with lifted hands,
> As once, in flesh, He rose from Bethany. J. M. H.

ON THE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF SCRIPTURE.

(Concluded from page 286.)

THE following is the conclusion of the paper with which Mr. Bickersteth has favoured us, and which we consider an interesting and valuable addition to his work on the Study of Scripture, though we are not pledged to concur in every opinion expressed in it. We refer especially to some of the remarks upon unfulfilled prophecy, and to the partial relegation of the sacred books to particular times and localities. Mr. Bickersteth (for he adopts his friend's paper) teaches that, among the writings of Moses, the book of Deuteronomy, and among the apostolic writings, "the epistle to the Corinthians and others"—he does not specify which—"claim most immediately our diligent search." The epistle to the Romans, "when first penned, and at the time of the Reformation," was "first of the Scriptures in practical worth;" but "the case is now very different; other dangers have arisen....and to meet these, other parts of Scripture, and even other epistles, are more needed." "Its chief immediate use seems to be as an antidote to the Pelagian leaven, which still lurks in high places." He applies the same remarks to the epistle to the Galatians. Now we cannot conceive that the epistle to the Romans has lost one tittle of its "practical worth." The Epistles, and indeed all the sacred records, form a whole; nor can we say of any part that it is not necessary for making the man of God perfect. There is great hazard of mistake or favouritism in specifying this or that part as more necessary, and other parts as less necessary, for particular ages or countries. The eulogium on the Epistles to the Corinthians, would seem to indicate that the Epistle to the Romans contains but little matter bearing on the Christian temper and duties; but the latter chapters of this Epistle refute such a supposition. We cannot concur in the opinion that the Pelagian leaven now lurks only in high places, and that therefore the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians may be comparatively overlooked. At all times the doctrine that justification is "by faith that it might be by grace," requires to be distinctly and unremittingly taught: to press other parts of the word of God upon the mind, while keeping this out of view, would tend to nourish self-righteousness, or to lead to despair. And if the

doctrine is at all times necessary, most especially is it so at the present moment, when strenuous efforts are made to bring back the delusive doctrines of Popery respecting the ground of a sinner's justification before God. Mr. Faber, we have lately seen, does not consider the discussion of this momentous subject ill-timed or superfluous; and if Mr. Bickersteth will put himself to the severe pain of reading Mr. Newman's recent treatise on Justification, he will not think St. Paul's letters to the Romans and Galatians among those which do not "claim most immediately our diligent search."—With these preliminary observations we proceed to the extract.

"As the prophecies have been, on the one hand, debased through the carnal blindness of the synagogue, they have been frittered away, on the other, by the vague and loose misinterpretations of the Christian church. They have thus been either lost in the mists of allegory, or tied down to events utterly disproportioned to the fulness of their meaning. Their spiritual application, and emblematic beauty, is indeed most highly to be prized, when it is not used as an engine to wrest from them their direct and plain reference,—to a glory of Israel that is still future. Used for this end, it is styled by God himself robbery for a burnt-offering. They form the spiritual harvest and vintage of the Jews, a harvest and vintage long delayed, but to be reaped in due season. And the charge of the law applies in spirit to the Gentile church. When thou comest into thy neighbour's vineyard, thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own pleasure, but thou shalt not put any into thine own vessel. In other words, we are free to the largest present use of Jewish promises, but we must beware of wresting them from their full and proper application, as a glorious reversion of privilege to the Jews themselves. The objection commonly urged, and often doubtless in much sincerity, against the simple and literal reception of these promises of Israel's glory, is that the Gospel has set aside all distinctions of special privilege; that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; that there is no difference of Jew nor Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. The simple and full reply lies in the fact, that however the grace of the Gospel, and its heavenly privileges, are in themselves free and open alike to all; in the manner of their dispensation to different nations there has been, and therefore may still be, the exercise of distinguishing and sovereign grace, till its triumph shall be complete. And as hitherto the Jew, though equally free to its mercies, has in fact been, above other nations, an alien from its blessings, it is perfectly consistent that he who from first has become last, may from last become first, and enjoy a pre-eminence of dignity and blessing, as before of curse and shame. And this stumbling-block removed, we are free to read in the prophecies God's purposes of grace to restored Israel, and, through them, to the whole world. The leading distinction in the view given of this blessedness by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, seems to answer much to those of the offices of King, of Prophet, and of Priest, which together form the full dignity of redeemed manhood. The royal character of Isaiah's prophecies, and the sacred features of those of Ezekiel, are indeed very apparent, and perhaps it might not be difficult to trace in Jeremiah a similar unity of design. In the minor prophets it is less easy to trace distinctive leading features, though all clearly converge in the same issues of blessedness, and righteousness, and peace.

"This third branch is again linked closely, like the loops of the tabernacle, with the two former. The connexion of the prophecies with the epistles is various, and often marked in the latter. Eph. ii. 2 Peter i. 19; iii. 2. Jude 4. Rev. xi. 26. The correspondence of the second of St. Peter with the two last chapters of Isaiah, has been noticed before. The second of the Thessalonians is again connected with Isaiah xi.; and again with Isaiah xxx—xxxii. The eighth of Hebrews is linked with Jer. xxxi.; and the ninth refers, though more obliquely, to his thirty-third chapter. Compare Heb. ix. 11. with Jer. xxxiii. 14—26. It would be easy to multiply instances of the same kind. Very large is the field of divine research comprised in these three subjects alone. And so close is the actual connection between all the parts of sacred truth, that the fullest understanding to be gained by these is but a small first-fruits till we return to them a second time, with the farther light to be derived from those which still remain to be considered.

"What then is the path of further inquiry and meditation, which the Jewish

prophecies open before us? To see this clearly, we must observe that they are composed chiefly of two parts, expostulations and promises. The expostulations are God's severe rebukes of Israel, for their forsaking of the law he had given. See Isaiah v. ix. xxix. Jer. ii. iii. v. viii. Ezek. xiv. xvi. xx.; and many other passages. The promises, again, while containing the substance of the Gospel, present it under a special form. The law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.—A law shall proceed from me, and I will cause my judgment to rest for a light of the people.—Judgment shall remain in the wilderness, and righteousness in the fruitful field.—I will put my laws in their hearts, and in their minds will I write them.—They shall learn the ways of my people.—I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them and of their children.—And I will put my Spirit upon them, and cause them to walk in my statutes, and do them.—All these, and many other promises, direct us to the law of God written in the heart, as the great means of the promised blessing. And still more express is the parting charge in Malachi. Remember the law of Moses my servant, which I gave in Horeb, for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments. To this law, which our Lord himself obeyed, and so magnified and made honourable, and which, he expressly declares, he came not to destroy but to fulfil, we seem directly summoned, in the approach of the great day of the Lord, by the Spirit speaking in the prophets, as the next and fourth great branch of Scriptural research and prayerful meditation.

"The book of the law, or in other words, the Pentateuch, seems then to form the next object of close and separate study. And as this has been long comparatively neglected by the church, and is yet, perhaps, one great means provided by the Spirit of God, for its revival in these times, before the redemption of Israel, it may be needful to explain it more fully in this view, to remove some of the misconceptions which have obscured its beauty and power; and thus assist in taking that stumbling-block from the Jews, which the neglect of their law, by Christians, while professing to own it as Divine, must have thrown in their way.

"The law of Moses has usually been regarded by Christians only in the light of its perversion by the self-righteousness of the Jews, and of the reasonings of the Apostle to the Gentiles, aimed entirely against that perversion. Hence they have been ready to regard its sole purpose as the conviction of sin, and that its office then ceases in the grace of the Gospel. But we have only to read any part of the Old Testament in simple faith, to see the partial and defective nature of such a view. The Psalm cxix. alone, may serve to shew that the law was indeed to the saints of old a direct and most powerful source of spiritual life, strength, and energy, not indeed in the letter, as an outward ordinance, but in the power of the quickening Spirit. The charge of the law itself is plainly, This word shall be in thy heart. The abuse, by the Jews, was trusting to some outward rites enjoined in it, when the spirit of those rites was unknown, and the great things of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, were wholly set aside. The aim of the Gospel is to supply, as a gift, what the law demands as a duty, but much more enjoins as a privilege and blessing—the law of God in the heart, graven there by the Spirit in fleshly tables, and thence issuing in the acts of a holy life.

"The law, indeed, is perfect, like all the works and words of God. Given by boundless love in inscrutable wisdom, it must have been of all truth the best suited for the welfare of the church at that time, and hence for the nourishment of infant faith in every age. In this respect, its worth must be more immediate than that of the Gospel itself, as milk for the infant is more nourishing than strong meat, which belongs to those of full age. And it is plain that the mere fact of being born under a higher dispensation, cannot of itself translate us from the state of spiritual childhood, or render the elements of truth less essential for our souls. The love which gave the revelations of the law, and tended the church in the wilderness, was the same which glows so brightly in the apostolic pages, and shews its brightness in the cross of Christ; but it was a love stooping to the capacity of its objects, and tempering its lustre, so as to lay closer and firmer hold on their weak and earthward spirit, than if it had been revealed in its higher glories. And when read in the faith of the crucified love which gave it at first, the same blessed fruits would still attend it. We shall there see God stooping to meet us, and find that he is indeed very near us, and be met on every side with the memorials, signs, and pledges of his goodness. In short, let us only believe that the law of Moses was given by the same love which suffered on the cross, and inspired the epistles, and that love will be brought more immediately and powerfully to bear upon our souls than in the epistles themselves. When Hagar submitted herself to Sarah, the household of faith was complete: when the law shall be read in the light of the Gospel, faith will resume its perfect

work; the whole earth will grow bright with the consciousness of God's gracious presence, and be filled with the glory of his condescension and love.

"To confirm this view from the pages of St. Paul, whose rebukes of Jewish perverters of the law have been the occasion mainly, by an opposite perversion, of its neglect among modern Christians, let us turn to 2 Corinthians iii., a chapter which has, from this very mistake, been seldom rightly explained in later writers. The Apostle, in the second verse, speaks of his intense and fervent love to the Corinthians, by which like names on the breast-plate of the high priest, they were graven on his heart—a love so deep and fervent as to be known and read of all men, and written there by the Spirit of the living God—as the true epistle of commendation, which made those outward warrants, in which the false apostles gloried, useless and vain. He then, after disclaiming from himself the praise of even a single thought or letter of this blessed and spiritual graving of love, takes occasion from the contrast between the outward epistles in the hand of the false teachers, and the living characters of love, burning in his own heart, to contrast the double dispensation of the law, when read as a covenant of works, and when seen in the light of the new covenant of grace, by which the law is freely promised to be written by the Spirit in the heart. The Apostle illustrates this contrast by an historic parable of the Law itself. Ex. xxxiv. 29—35. Moses there represents the Law of which he was the minister. Read by carnal self-righteous eyes, its holiness and purity are too bright to be endured. To the Jews, this veil remains unto this day untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament. They screen themselves behind the veil of a ritual observance, in which its true meaning is hidden, from the clear glory of its Divine effulgence. 'But whensoever he turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away.' 2 Cor. iii. 16. Ex. xxxiv. 34. Septuag. In other words, the Law, when read in the light of His grace who is the Lord its Giver, and whose end in the gift is not to exact from us a bodily service, but to reveal to us his own nearness, presence, condescending holiness and love; becomes bright with His reflected glory, and brings down that glory, like Moses from the Mount, into nearer, closer, and more blessed influence on our souls. It then becomes a beauteous mirror wherein to read the goodness of our God and Saviour. Now the Lord is that Spirit: the sight of Christ and his grace in all the legal ordinances, is the Spirit which is to quicken them into means of life: and 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;' the spirit of bondage is gone, and we read only, that as in a mirror we may gaze on the loving-kindness of our Lord. And thus 'we all,' in this mirror, 'with unveiled face, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' Such is the transforming power of the Law of Moses, in the view of the Apostle, when once we come to read it in the light of the New Covenant.

"When, indeed, we remember by whom the Law was given, with such high sanctions of its worth, to his chosen people, and through them to all the true Israel, as their daily meditation, and the code of their personal and social welfare; even the Lord, whose greatness is unsearchable, and wisdom infinite; we cannot but come to the conviction that it contains far more and deeper truth than we have long been accustomed to read in its pages. Perhaps, indeed, it may yet be the work of a whole dispensation to vindicate the despised glory of these ordinances and messages of God. Certainly, when we remember that a large part of the Epistle to the Hebrews is only an inspired commentary on three verses of Genesis (Gen. xiv. 17, 18, 20.), in themselves not more remarkable than many others—and that in these the Apostle argues as much from the silence of Scripture as from its actual statements—we must be persuaded that exhaustless treasures of grace and wisdom lie couched in these sacred writings, and may offer from the heart that prayer of the Psalmist: 'Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of the book of thy law.'

"It is easy to see how a living and deep acquaintance with the Pentateuch would lead on naturally to all the other parts of Scripture. The histories will then be read in the double light of moral illustrations of the effects of its breach, and types of the great realities of the Gospel. The Psalms will be the spiritual expansion of its worship; the Proverbs, of its lessons of social righteousness; Ecclesiastes, as summed by its own penman, of the vanity of every departure from this divine standard; and Canticles, of the deep and mysterious fulness of that love of Christ which it unfolds, and which it is its aim to plant in every breast, and especially to occupy and renew, by its deep and living energy, all the domestic ordinances appointed by God. The prophets exhibit its triumphant establishment over all that opposes its blessed power; while the Gospels reveal the love and grace of its great Author, the sacrifice which takes away all the sin of the world, and the grace which by a thousand emblems of mercy reveals his deep, tender,

and earnest desire to fill the hearts of the creatures of God with the fulness of his own holiness, peace, truth, and love. May we experience more and more how great is his goodness and his beauty.

"Though all the books of the law seem then to demand from the church, in this day, an attention and study which have been long withheld, and through which, it is most probable, the way will be prepared, in these times, for that conversion of Israel of which the prophets are full, and of which we seem already to witness the political signs, both in the state of the earth, and in the spirit of Christian legislation losing sight, as it is fast doing, of the lesson of righteousness in their fall, and therefore needing to be taught it by their recovery, (Rom. xi. 22—25.); though such attention and study are due to all; yet, just as the Epistles to the Corinthians and others, among the Apostolic writings, so among those of Moses, the book of Deuteronomy claims most immediately our diligent search. It is more free than the others from Jewish elements and typical forms of truth, and presents, almost without a veil, the great maxims of personal and national well-being, in the obedience, worship, and love of God. But, most of all, by the redoubled energy and power of its practical exhortations it forms the needful counterpoise to the passive character of the doctrines of grace, and that spirit of fatalism which is their grand abuse,—a counterpoise which the church never required so much as at the present day. There runs through all its pages an authority, an energy, a tone of joy, confidence, and strength, which makes it the fit and proper medicine for the sentimental, weak, and sickly state of modern piety. The hundred and nineteenth Psalm is its practical commentary, and shews how truly it redeems from a religion of terms and fictions, to one of deep, living, and intense experience. And it is a special and crowning mark of its excellence, that from this book alone our Lord himself drew the weapons by which to repel every assault of his great adversary.

"The historical books in the Old Testament, and the Gospels and Acts in the New, would still remain to be considered. The former of these are too wide and various to be viewed separately here; it may be enough to point out a few leading objects in a profitable perusal. First, they are full of examples in various ranks and differing circumstances of life, and present to us almost every form of evil to be avoided and of excellence to be pursued, and thus surround us with a great cloud of witnesses, to confirm our faith and quicken our zeal. Secondly, they exhibit the statutes and laws of God in their practical application, the miseries resulting from their breach, and the personal and national blessings that follow on simple and devoted obedience. Thirdly, they unfold a rich variety of types and earnests of the grace of the Gospel of Christ, in his own person as Prophet, Priest, and King, in the greatness of his work of sacrifice, and in the glory of his coming kingdom.

"In this large and varied part of Scripture, there are three books, however, which seem to have, at present, a special claim to our attention, and those, perhaps, among the most neglected. These are the last in historical order, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. The prophecies of Daniel and St. John alike direct us to these, as the patterns and types of the rebuilding of the temple of God, and cleansing of the sanctuary at the overthrow of antichrist, and the fall of the mystic Babylon under the seventh vial.

"These books are indeed, on several accounts, more immediately adapted than the other sacred histories, to the wants of the church at the present time. Their minute details teach more strongly than any abstract lesson, that no labour in the cause of God is too trivial, too secular, too involved in worldly politics, or perplexed by human weakness, to escape his notice and his approving eye. The absence of miracles makes them more directly suited to these times when God's open hand is withdrawn and veiled, and removes the temptation to think the church forsaken, because no signs or wonders are wrought in her behalf. The weakness, too, of the church in these last inspired histories before the coming of Christ, shews that the waning of one dispensation only marks the dawn of another more bright and glorious. The place which they occupy, at the junction of sacred and profane history, gives them a further value. They serve thus as a point of departure from which we may trace onward the hand of God through the whole course of history, where His presence is veiled from a careless eye. The book of Esther, itself a full and perfect type, seems expressly designed, by the remarkable and total omission of the Divine name, to answer this important end. If the silence of Scripture, in Genesis, upon Melchisedec's birth, parentage, and death, be full of meaning, the omission here must no less have a purpose. How well it describes the mysteries of Providence for the last seventeen centuries, since the miraculous gifts of the Spirit ceased, where the world sees no trace of His presence,

till at length the King of heaven shall wake as from deep sleep, and the kingdom be given to the saints of the Most High.

"The Gospels form the last branch of Scripture study; and perhaps the most important, if only we could rise to a full view of the mysteries of love and wisdom which they reveal. A few suggestions only can here be given, towards a deeper insight into their meaning, than many gain by a vague perusal. First, let each Gospel be viewed as a whole, having a distinct aim, and presenting a distinct view of our Lord's character and glory. Thus St. Matthew exhibits chiefly his kingly office; St. Mark, his prophetic works, as the interpreter of nature in its spiritual meaning; St. Luke, his sacred and priestly consecration; St. John, his heavenly dignity, and true Godhead, as the only-begotten Son of the Father. In this view, each Gospel will be seen to possess an unity and completeness, which the use of harmonies merely breaks and destroys. Secondly, let the quotations from the prophets be fully searched, with the whole context, till the full and proper scope of the passage be seen, and its true bearing on our Lord's work and office. Thirdly, let all the works of our Lord be viewed as parables of the spiritual mercies he conveys, and pledges and earnests of spiritual blessings to come. By attending to these few and simple directions, under the blessing of God, every page will more and more be lighted up with an exceeding fulness of glory.

"Finally, let us ever remember, that the word of God is not only a landscape on which we may gaze with still fresh delight, and a table where our souls may be fed with heavenly manna, but a mine filled with unsearchable riches of grace and love. The larger our faith in its wisdom and goodness, the richer blessing shall we gain in our own meditations on its truths. Wondrous are the mysteries it contains; wondrous are the treasures of divine love that it reveals; we need only that our eyes may be opened to behold them. May this be, therefore, our constant prayer: may our eyes be ever lifted in faith to God's sanctuary, and our hearts waiting for his blessing from above, and the promised aid of His Spirit, to guide us into all truth; and then we shall neither read nor meditate in vain, but grow daily in grace and in the knowledge of Christ, till we come to see Him as He is, and are satisfied, when we awake with His likeness."

REMARKS ON A POPULAR HYMN.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

PERMIT me to trouble you with a few thoughts on a hymn which, though adopted in most collections, appears to me open to very serious objections. I allude to the one commencing, "All hail the power of Jesu's name;" each verse of which concludes with the invocation, "Crown him Lord of all." This invocation, to whomsoever addressed, I feel to be inconsistent as used by any created being. I cannot trace any parallel whatever in Scripture language, either in the Old or New Testament, to the sentiment here conveyed. He "by whom all things were created, and for whom," was once crowned with thorns by those whom he had formed, and by some, perhaps, of those who would have taken him by force, and made him a king; but no where can I trace the slightest analogy between the honours due to him "whom God hath highly exalted, and given a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow;" and that conveyed by the idea of a coronation under any circumstances whatever.

I do not speak of intention on the part of those who use the hymn, and sing the words, with the devoutest feeling; but there is no occasion, and I think the practice fraught with danger, to use terms in a conventional meaning, in opposition to all that is fairly conveyed by the letter, and even the spirit, of an expression. A coronation essentially implies a natural equality of being, and an expressed or implied

contract between the sovereign and the subject—to each of whom belong distinctive rights and claims; but He who has on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords, receives not honour from man. The crown

> ——————"Was his
> By ancient covenant, ere nature's birth,
> And he has made it his by purchase since."

Can it then be the province of any creature to presume to place a crown on his head? Is it not theirs rather to wait in humble hope of bowing before him with those who cast their crowns before the throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created!"

Many think, that in using this hymn as an act of worship they are ascribing Divine sovereignty to their Saviour; and yet what is there in the sentiment that might not be adopted in all its parts by Arians of every school, and by some Socinians, who are willing to concede every thing to our Lord, but an eternal, underived sovereignty; and I cannot trace any sentiment of this sort in the whole of the hymn, either expressed or implied.

It is doubtless desirable that every natural feeling should be consecrated to the service of God; but reverence requires understanding as well as feeling. Perhaps natural feeling rises (under the influence of music, and every external appendage calculated to excite the mind) to its highest point, when an earthly sovereign is crowned, and all the people shout "God save the king: God save the king." I see nothing to object to in this, and could heartily say, Amen. But when the "Lord of all" is to be adored, it becomes the creature, in the expression of his feelings, to use only such expressions as are justified both by Scripture example and by the sober analysis of the words, and are worthy (I mean only comparatively, not abstractedly) of Him whom we address. Our psalmody has not yet exhausted Scriptural sentiments, and we need not travel in search of a phraseology which, while it may convey one idea to those accustomed to its use, yet to a simple uninitiated man conveys one very different.

Allow me to take this opportunity to wish you success in your new series. A wanderer in distant lands, I have not forgotten the friend of my youth; and such has the Christian Observer been to me. I rejoice at the arrival of your monthly instructions, and gladly do I hail the table of those where I now and then find you, in this far-off region, the friend and ornament of the study or the drawing-room. Heartily wishing you accelerated progress, and renewed strength on your journey, I remain, &c.

X. I. Y.

THE REV. DR. J. P. SMITH UPON THE NARRATIVE OF BALAAM.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Homerton, May 1, 1838.

I HAD hoped never to have to trouble you again upon any subject personal to myself; but another unwelcome necessity is laid upon me. To your Correspondent "A Layman," I owe respectful thanks for the considerate, kind, and judicious manner in which he has ani-

madverted upon a kind of discourse, *obtained and published surreptitiously*, but which I am bound to acknowledge as substantially my own.

In August or September last, a beloved friend asked if I had published a Sermon upon *Balaam's Ass*. I answered, No; and was not a little surprised at the inquiry. Had his question been, What is your sentiment upon that part of the Sacred History?—I have scarcely a doubt that I should have replied, that, in my judgment, the common exposition, that God was pleased in a miraculous manner to produce the semblance of a human voice proceeding from the mouth of the animal. My friend informed me of the fact upon which your Correspondent has written. I was almost incredulous. More than once I have suffered severe mortification and distress, from finding Sermons or Lectures which I had delivered, published, and their notices placarded in the streets, without consent or privity on my part. Some of those publications I have refrained from seeing: others, which I have had the pain of reading, were extremely different from what I had, at least, intended to say. This is a trial of patience and submission to which, I fear, preachers of all denominations must silently bow; for there appear to be no means of either prevention or remedy.

After a little time I recollected the having occupied my week-evening lecture, some years ago, by a familiar course upon the principal facts of the Pentateuch. My Sermon-register shewed me that the time taken up in that course was a year and a half, and that the subject, on April 11, 1827, was the *History and Character of Balaam*. Having procured the printed Sermon, I must say that I found it much more respectably *got up* (a vulgar but appropriate phrase) than I had anticipated: so that I do not wonder at the Layman's saying, "It would seem that Dr. Smith either furnished the manuscript, or inspected it, or corrected the proof-sheet." Here, then, is an instance of a plain and familiar lecture, delivered to a small congregation; taken down by one or more writers, kept in reserve upwards of ten years, then published without notification of date or any other circumstance,—and all this without the slightest knowledge or suspicion on the part of the preacher!

Hard measure as this is, I cannot refuse to *be held responsible* for the general purport of the discourse: but it is utterly beyond my power to vouch for "the phraseology, and the special words," though the internal evidence is in favour of the short-hand writer's ability and accuracy. I have observed only two errors in the extract given by the Layman, (13th for 35th, and *unequal* for perhaps *unequalled*,) which may be errors of the printer. Hence, my worthy remarker may infer, how uncertain are even very probable conclusions drawn from such premises as led him to write—I am persuaded, from excellent motives—"There *can be* no question as to the authenticity of this extract."

As I have said above, the matter had entirely faded from my memory. I have no document whatever, except the brief notes which I will copy, hoping for the favour of your inserting them:—

"Vers. 20—35. This seems to me to have been transacted in a dream or vision of that night. Compare ver. 9; and many of the emblematical images and representations made to the minds of the

Prophets in other ages: for instance, Gen. xv. 12—17; Isaiah vi.; many instances in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and others.

"The only objection is from 2 Pet. ii. 16. But, as it was a miraculous representation to Balaam's mind, the moral instruction is not the less solid. May we not adduce John xii. 41, compared with Isaiah vi.? Supported by the speaking of the animal not exciting any *surprise* in Balaam's mind; and the continued dialogue: and the Divine anger being against Balaam for going, though permitted."

I now ask leave to make a few observations:—

I. It is evident that, eleven years ago, in a lecture of which the design was not so much critical disquisition as practical improvement, I adopted the interpretation of this part of the narrative which occasioned your correspondent's animadversions: and for those animadversions I esteem and thank him from the heart.

II. Every candid person will admit, I think, that the subject is not without difficulty.

III. Upon the hypothesis of a vision, the miraculous intervention of Jehovah is not by any means diminished. The question turns upon the *kind* of miracle that was wrought. From my scanty notes it would appear that I had referred to others of the later prophets, besides Isaiah, for proofs of the fact that phenomena of Divine visions are sometimes narrated as if they had been outward occurrences. The instances of that kind are not few.

IV. Scripture-critics of no mean name have maintained the hypothesis of a vision, as having taken place, not indeed in the night (to which I had assigned it), but while Balaam was on his way to join the princes of Moab. The time requisite to admit of either the outward transaction or the vision, needed not to be long. Even fifteen minutes would have sufficed. The authors to whom I refer are Maimonides, Jortin, Seiler, Dathe, and, with some remaining hesitation, John David Michaelis.

V. In consequence of having been excited to a renewed investigation, it is my duty to profess that I now think the *preponderance of evidence to be in favour* of the generally received interpretation. So far as I can recollect, I have expressed that sentiment, when the subject has incidentally come before me in preaching or expounding.

VI. Some remarks upon the Layman's paper:—

1. I fully accord to him that the argument from Balaam's not appearing surprised, and his conversing with his beast as if such colloquy was in the ordinary course of nature, is neutralized by being referred to the brevity of the narrative. It is not the manner of the Sacred writers to mention collateral circumstances, when not necessary to the main design of a passage. In instances without number we must supply them from the estimate of a moral certainty. Josephus does indeed say that Balaam was alarmed; but he, no doubt, inserted the idea out of his own mind, according to his manner in amplifying the Scriptural narratives.

2. This characteristic brevity of the Hebrew style warrants our supposing, with humble modesty, other subordinate circumstances which are not mentioned; but which appear necessary and important. The clause, verse 21,—"Balaam ... saddled his ass,"—has often been an object of ridicule to profane and *ignorant* men. The constant idiom of the Hebrew language, (putting simple verbs of action to denote the

causing, commanding, declaring, or permitting, of the action,) requires us to understand this as signifying that *he directed his servants* to do what was requisite. Also; under this specification of a single action, we are, by a common *synecdoche*, to understand the whole combination of actions in preparation for such a journey, which could be scarcely less than 500 miles. The embassy (for so it may well be called) from the king of Moab, must have consisted, not only of princes and nobles, whose rank was to mark the importance of their mission, but also of a numerous body of men, for defence against the wild beasts and the marauders of the desert; and of camels and asses, for the carrying of provision and water. Hence, an accession of probability, even certainty, comes to the Layman's supposition that so numerous a party must have either made their own encampment, or obtained accommodation in some building apart from Balaam's abode; and that, in his eagerness to earn the wages of unrighteousness, he, *violated the conditions* annexed to the first permission, and set out with his own attendants to join the caravan.

But I repudiate the Layman's insinuation (p. 299) that I had passed over an idea which he points out, in order to avoid an "awkward consequence*." Such a proceeding would have been artful and dishonest. In all my endeavours to search out the mind of God in his word, and to communicate the results to others, I can, through his mercy, protest that I have never acted so,—"because of the fear of God;—not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully." (Nehem. v. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 2.) Besides, I cannot be sure that I did not advert to the point in question; and the surreptitious publication is surely not entitled to be a conclusive evidence as to what I did not say. The omission of passages in Jeremiah, &c., to which my notes refer, may render this not unlikely.

3. It may not be improper to advert to the propensity, in modern times, to connect the idea of something contemptible and ridiculous with the phrase, *Balaam and his ass.* Persons who become scoffers in this way ought to be told that they are ignorant of antiquity, of Asiatic manners, and of natural history. In ancient times, and in the usages of Western and Central Asia, the ass was a handsome, vigorous, and every way respectable animal; commonly used for riding, which horses were not; and suitable to the rank of the most dignified persons. The circumstance of riding upon an ass, frequently mentioned in the Scripture histories, did not involve the least idea of disparagement, but the very contrary.

4. The Layman will not be displeased with me for remarking, that in p. 299 he has fallen into a common cause of error, the assuming of our version as a basis of argumentation. He expands the particle

* In justice both to Dr. Smith and the Layman we ought to state that we feel fully assured that the latter intended no insinuation against Dr. Smith's honesty. He only said that if the 21st verse is taken literally, and not as a part of the alleged dream, it would lead to a consequence contradictory to Dr. Smith's hypothesis. We do not think he so much as meant that Dr. Smith was aware of this, much less that he wilfully perverted Scripture to avoid it. His paper is written with much candour; and is altogether free from those pungent remarks about "German divinity," "neology," and so forth, which some of Dr. Smith's dissenting brethren have used very freely, both orally and we believe in print, in regard to some of their friend's hypotheses. We are glad to find him relinquishing his former opinion respecting the narrative of Balaam, and should rejoice if he should ultimately see his way clear to admit the canonicity of Solomon's Song.

so (in the clause of verse 35—"So Balaam went with the princes of Balak") into a striking reflection upon the rebellious pertinacity of the unhappy man. But there is no such particle in the Hebrew, which may be closely rendered thus,—"And the angel of Jehovah said to Balaam, Go with the men; and nothing beyond the speaking which I will speak to thee shalt thou speak.....and Balaam went with the princes of Balak."

5. I am happy in declaring my concurrence with the Layman's observation, that the expressions in verses 20, 22, and 35, are "probably designed by God as a warning against that dangerous species of self-deception, which consists in confounding what God *commands* with what he *permits*; and which so often leads men to steer their course by a regard to what they view as providential intimations, rather than by the obvious dictates of conscience and duty." I pray God that this great lesson may be universally learned, and faithfully observed.

J. PYE SMITH.

MARTYROLOGICAL ANTIQUITIES OF OXFORD.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

AMONG other services which certain Protestants have been forward in rendering to Popery, not the least has been the attempt to invalidate, as much as possible, the truth of our faithful martyrologist, John Foxe. In a letter which I took the liberty of addressing to you, in reference to a paper by your correspondent Zenas, I maintained the fidelity of Foxe; and that Latimer and Ridley suffered martyrdom on the very spot recorded in his Martyrology. At the time of writing my letter, which appeared in your Number for September 1837, I little thought of a circumstance occurring which fully establishes his accuracy; but, not many weeks since, some workmen, who were employed in making a drain in Broad Street, opposite the door of the Master of Baliol's lodgings, found, at the depth of about three feet from the *present* surface, such a quantity of ashes and burnt sticks, as plainly indicated that they had discovered the spot on which the martyrs suffered. Now that the truth of Foxe has been thus unexpectedly confirmed, I would advise that a memorial be immediately erected on the spot, to perpetuate the memory of those who shed their blood for the defence of the Gospel, and who that day "lighted such a candle in England" as we trust "will never be put out."

LUTHER.

REMINISCENCES OF BISHOP HALL. No. 1.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I PROMISED, some time since, after the detail of a visit to Oxford, to transmit the results of any subsequent journey I might take; and having been lately called by business to visit the ancient and interesting city of Norwich, perhaps a short notice on the occasion may not prove unacceptable. I need hardly say that I found the noble nave of the cathedral, although perhaps boasting of columns less massy and not so decorated as those of Durham, presenting as pure a specimen of the Norman (or, rather, Roman) architecture, as that or any other

cathedral where the same imposing order is found; and after joining with great delight in the week-day service (of which the noble anthem of "Great is the Lord" formed a part), I had much pleasure in examining the edifice itself—and especially the cloisters, the grandeur and elegance of which I should think can hardly be exceeded elsewhere; but particularly a highly enriched door-way (now closed) leading from them into the cathedral.

The oft-quoted lines of Milton could not but be vividly recalled to my memory:

> "And let my due feet never fail
> To walk the studious cloisters' pale,
> And love the high embowed roof,
> With antique pillars massy proof,
> And storied windows richly dight,
> Casting a dim religious light;
> There let the pealing organ blow
> To the full-voice quire below,
> In service high, and anthem clear,
> As may with sweetness through mine ear
> Dissolve me into ecstasies,
> And bring all heaven before mine eyes."

The "storied window" alone seemed wanting; for the destruction of which in the civil wars a modern substitution afforded no compensation.

I always find something in the circumstances of locality which invests an edifice of this antiquity with a certain charm, which Johnson has so admirably detailed in his visit to Iona, that I should despair of describing, as he has done, the sensations which arise on such occasions, and still more of defining their cause, which even he has scarcely attempted; and I shall therefore content myself with observing, in reference to the cathedral of Norwich, that the *beau-ideal* which chiefly absorbed my imagination was the image of the venerable and estimable Bishop Hall: so that the idea of his eye having once rested on the same beautiful proportions with which I beheld the choir so richly adorned, and more especially the thought of his voice having once been heard inviting sinners to repentance from its pulpit, appeared to invest the place with a character which may perhaps be better conceived than described.

On inquiring (very naturally) for the spot which covered his remains, I was told that they rested elsewhere; and that not even the meanest memorial of him was to be found in his own cathedral. Being referred, however, to Heigham (a village in the neighbourhood), I immediately repaired thither; and was not a little gratified with my visit. Before, however, I quit the city, let me remind your readers of a few particulars of the Bishop's history, which are partly collected from his own account of his life, which he opens with that memorable paragraph: "Not out of a vain affectation of my own glory, which I know how little it can avail me when I am gone hence, but out of a sincere desire to give glory to my God, whose wonderful providence I have noted in all my ways, have I recorded some remarkable passages of my forepast life: what *I* have done is worthy of nothing but silence and forgetfulness, but what God hath done for me is worthy of everlasting and thankful memory." He then records of his mother, that "she was a woman of rare sanctity, continually exercised with the affliction of a weak body, and oft of a wounded spirit; the agonies whereof she would oft recount with much passion, professing that the greatest

bodily sicknesses were as nothing to those scorpions: so from them all at last she found a happy deliverance. She had so profited in the school of Christ, that it was hard for any friend to come from her discourse no whit holier. How often have I blessed the memory of those Divine passages of experimental divinity which I have heard from her mouth! What day did she pass without a large task of private devotion, whence she would still come forth with a countenance of undissembled mortification! Never any lips have read to me such feeling lectures of piety; neither have I known any soul that more accurately practised them, than her own. Temptations, desertions, and spiritual comforts, were her usual theme. Shortly—for I can hardly take off my pen from so exemplary a subject—her life and death were saint-like."

And who (let me ask) can wish that the Bishop had "taken off his pen" a moment earlier? Surely we have here another testimony to the value of a pious mother; nor will it be any loss of time, or matter of regret, to any of your younger readers, to "take off" their attention from your pages, for the purpose of blessing God if they possess the same advantage, and to pray that they may use it as Bishop Hall did.

Some of those readers who have been called to the privilege of a University education will sympathize with the good Bishop, when he next rejoices, with all his heart, and blesses God accordingly, that an event which he considers the earliest providence of his life, should have induced his father to send him to college in preference to private tuition; of which, in a peculiar case (but without the slightest depreciation of private tuition, under different circumstances), he thus remarks: "There," says he, "were all the hopes of my future life near upon blasting; but what was the issue? O God! thy providence made and found it. Thou knowest how sincerely and heartily, in those my young days [ætatis 15], I did cast myself upon thy hands; with what faithful resolution I did, on this particular occasion, resign myself over to thy disposal; earnestly begging of thee, in my fervent prayers, to order all things for the best, and confidently waiting upon thy will for the event. Certainly never did I, in all my life, more clearly roll myself upon the Divine providence, than I did in this business; and it succeeded accordingly."

And here let my younger friends learn the blessing of having God for their friend and adviser, since we thus find Bishop Hall declaring, in advanced life, that he had trusted God so heartily, and prayed to him so fervently at the age of fifteen. "Does any one lack wisdom? let him ask of God:" "Is any afflicted? let him pray." Not a want for the present, nor a fear for the future, but it may be "rolled upon" our heavenly Father, who alone can direct the ways and sanctify the studies of the young. Nor was he wanting in gratitude for this interposition, for he adds: "O God, how was I then taken up with a thankful acknowledgment and joyful admiration of thy Divine providence!" After two years, however, he was recalled from Cambridge, because (as he says) his "father's not very large cistern was to feed many pipes besides;" but here an unhoped-for benefactor bearing one half of his maintenance, he was enabled to return; and he adds, "Never durst I appear in any of the exercises of scholarship till I had, from my knees, looked up to heaven for a blessing, and renewed my actual dependance upon that Divine hand."

After recording many vicissitudes of fortune—during which, he says,

"I was forced to write books to buy books,"—he was called to an attendance upon no less a personage than Prince Henry, the promising son of James I., who (like a youthful predecessor) was so prematurely taken from the hopes of the nation. In spite, however, of this summons to court, he preferred the cure of Waltham, where, he says, (as at Halstead before) he preached thrice in the week; and adds, "never did I climb into the pulpit to preach any sermon whereof I had not before, in my poor and plain fashion, penned every word in the same order wherein I hoped to deliver it, although in the expression I listed not to be a slave to syllables." And here permit me, for a moment, to observe that if any modern admirers of Bishop Hall should feel more favourably disposed towards *written* sermons from this remark of the Bishop, I shall not regret having made this quotation.

In recording the circumstances attending his next call of duty, the Bishop piously exclaims—"O God, what a hand hast thou in the carriage of this work!" After noticing his appointment to the bishopric of Exeter, (which he refers to the "extraordinary hand of God," his nomination having taken place only a few hours before the arrival of the Duke of Buckingham's letter from France, which, he says, would certainly have prevented it), he adds,—"some that sat at the stern of the church" [he alludes to Archbishop Laud] "had me in great jealousy for too much favour of Puritanism," and for giving "too much liberty of frequent lecturings within my charge." Upon which trial he observes—"the billows went so high that I was three several times upon my knees to his Majesty to answer these great criminations, and I was sensible under how dark a cloud I was, that I plainly told the Archbishop of Canterbury, that, rather than I would be obnoxious to those slanderous tongues of his misinformers, I would cast up my rochet;" so true was it then, as always, that "they that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." Soon after this the bishop was called to Norwich, but "how" (says he) "*I took the tower in my way,* and how I have been dealt with since my repair to Norwich, I could be lavish in the sad report; ever desiring my good God to enlarge my heart in thankfulness to him for the sensible experience I have had of his fatherly hand over me in the deepest of all my afflictions, and to strengthen me for whatever other trials he shall be pleased to call me unto; that being found faithful unto death, I may obtain that crown of life which he hath ordained for all those that overcome."

I shall, however, with your leave, defer till next month some notice of the good bishop's "taking the tower in his way;" as also of his subsequent experience, which may possibly not prove without its use to ourselves in the present comparatively peaceful state of the Church.

ZENAS.

HANNAH MORE'S REMOVAL FROM BARLEY WOOD.

For the Christian Observer.

In perusing Mr. Roberts's account of the death-bed of Hannah More, in the Christian Observer for May, I am reminded of the narrative, by Mr. Cottle, of her expulsion from Barley Wood, which, though written in a wretched style of attempted pleasantry, illustrates the blessed

truth that "all things work together for good to them that love God;" and that when, like the patriarch Jacob, the Christian is ready to say "all these things are against me," his heavenly Father is often about to do for him "exceeding abundantly above all that he asks or thinks." If after the death of her beloved sisters there was any event which seemed likely to be literally a death-blow to Hannah More, it must surely have been the expulsion, in her old age, from the lovely spot which she had caused to bloom in the wild, and which was associated with her fondest recollections; an expulsion embittered also by much to irritate temper and mortify pride, as well as to wound her feelings; for, as Mr. Roberts represents her as saying, "she was driven out of paradise, but not by angels;"—a remark which graphically depicts her sense of her loss, and her cheerful temper under it, though coming too near to a playful allusion to Holy Writ to be unexceptionable. It is scarcely possible to imagine any circumstance which could more deeply have afflicted the mind of one who had written so much, and so well, upon the regulation of Christian families, and the management of servants and of the young, than to discover that her own abode was the scene of ungodliness and riot; and that while her books and tracts were circulated to the very ends of the earth, as containing most valuable lessons of "Practical Piety" and "Christian Morals," her own neighbours, nay, the very children in the schools which she had formed and so fondly watched over—to say nothing of her defamers—could ask what her theories were worth, when they appeared to succeed so ill in practice; for the distressing facts would be blazoned, without the counterpoising circumstances; as if all her plans, and maxims, and invaluable labours, public and private, had been thrown away, because an aged invalid lady, confined to her sick chamber, was over-reached by the deep-laid hypocrisy of a nest of domestic conspirators. Aged persons seldom long survive being uprooted from the accustomed scenes of their best days; but Hannah More's evulsion was peculiarly rude and dangerous; yet she had cause in the end to bless God for this as for every other affliction; her pecuniary expences and worldly anxieties were diminished; she was brought within the immediate reach of her friends, physicians, and spiritual advisers; and as the hours of active usefulness were over, nothing was left for her to do but to ripen for heaven. In a world of change and trial such narratives are valuable, in order to calm our impatient anxieties concerning the morrow, which, when it comes, will take heed for itself; for sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. How many thousands of individuals and families in this commercial island live in constant alarm, lest circumstances should occur which may render it necessary to break up their old habits and connexions, and to pass the season of old age in new and untried scenes, amidst unaccustomed mortifications or privations. Hannah More, it is true, was not thus circumstanced, as she only changed her abode without diminishing her comforts; but her friends had great fears for her; since to pass her few remaining years at Barley Wood, and to die where she had seen her beloved sisters die, was perhaps her dearest earthly wish; and the same merciful Providence which thus promoted her happiness amidst events which seemed likely to impair it, could equally have sustained and cheered her, had her affairs proved altogether desolate and bankrupt.

The following is Mr. Cottle's account:—The "sensible Lady," it

would appear from Mr. Roberts's narrative, was Miss Frowd, who must be too sensible to approve of Mr. Cottle's style of narration.

"The circumstance which occasioned Mrs. Hannah More to quit for ever her beautiful residence of Barley Wood, is thus obscurely hinted at, by Mr. Roberts, in his life of H. M. 'The painful discoveries which had been made at Barley Wood, of ingratitude and baseness in those whom her bounty had so long fed and fostered, had, it is to be presumed, somewhat diminished its attractions; so that upon the whole there was but little cause of regret in adopting a change which the helplessness and infirmities of age had rendered expedient.' This is about as explicit a statement as could be expected in a regular and grave piece of biography; but as this work is of a more desultory, and less presuming nature, (and the particulars being known to myself) without any dread of a diminution of dignity, I shall enter a little more into detail, which, it is believed, will prove acceptable, as well as new, to most of Mrs. H. More's surviving friends, while the aggravating circumstances in which she was placed cannot fail of exciting sympathy even in the stranger.

"Hannah More's servants, in some respects, appear to have been of the worst description. After the successive deaths of her four beloved and excellent sisters, who all lived to between seventy and eighty, Hannah More was left in a state that would have proved cheerless, but for the consolations of religion. A few friends testified the strength of their attachment, by alternately living with her (particularly one, who will hereafter be denominated, the 'Sensible Lady,') to write many of her letters, or otherwise to become her amanuensis; and also, so far as it was practicable, to give a general superintendance over her household, and especially her domestics, now disorganized, and, as might be expected, tenacious of every interference. This inspection became the more necessary, as Hannah More, for some preceding years, had been permanently confined to her room.

"Under such unfavourable circumstances, the greatest confusion reigned in the kitchen. It was literally, 'high life below stairs.' Hannah More's servants, it seemed, sent their vivâ voce invitations (writing being an accomplishment) to the servants of some of the neighbouring families, and occasionally had their evening winter parties, with hot suppers, laid out in parlour-like elegance. Their plan was to avoid noise, till the family had retired to rest, and then their orgies commenced. Mrs. Susan, the housekeeper; and Miss Teddy, the ladies' maid; and Mrs. Rebecca, the housemaid; and Mrs. Jane, the cook; and Miss Sally, the little scullion; and Mr. Timothy, the coachman; and Mr. John, the gardener; and Mr. Tom, the gardener's man: all these superbly decorated, that is, in their best, waited to receive their frilled and furbelowed guests; some creeping through hedges; others descending down laurel walks, or emerging from thickets, at the appointed midnight hour, till they all assembled at the grand rendezvous. Here there was one only order of the night, and that was silence. All the rest was within the prescribed bounds. But notwithstanding that so many advantages were here combined, there was one unconquerable disadvantage. Dancing was proscribed, as it might convey awkward intimations.

"Ingenuity, if it cannot find that which it desires, will invent equivalent substitutes. Although this Barley Wood assemblage of fashionables could not dance at home, there was no statute law, nor conscience, against their dancing out; and not to be debarred from this delectable amusement, so admired by their betters, they determined that their regular balls should be held in a large room, a mile off, belonging to a tradesman who supplied the family; who could be obliged in various ways, and who, if he had been asked who were the two greatest personages in the parish? would instantly have replied, 'Why Mrs. Susan, and Mr. Timothy, to be sure.'

"Unprincipled persons, however vigilant in guarding the avenues to detection, eventually, with the spirit of infatuation, forget to close some one door, through which discovery enters. The Barley Wood High Mightinesses had determined to begin the season with a grand ball, to which sundry other servants, and the prime carpenters and bricklayers of the vicinity, should be invited, at the old haunt, there to meet their superiors, and, with the assistance of the village scraper, to keep moving 'on the light fantastic toe,' till morning 'gan dawn.' It so happened that Miss Teddy, my lady's-maid, ordered of her mantua-maker, in Bristol, 'a bran new dress,' to be sent down by a given day, as 'that evening she was going, with others, to a dance at Wrington.' This mantua-maker thought something not quite right going forward, and expressed her suspicions to a lady known to Hannah More, who immediately conveyed her information to the lady;

then in waiting at Barley Wood, and, in addition, conveyed Miss Teddy's letter. The fears of this 'sensible lady' being excited, she determined to take no notice; to say nothing to her aged friend; but when the suspected evening arrived, to be doubly vigilant.

"In the course of the appointed day, 'the bran new dress' was received. The ominous evening drew near. The eight servants were called up, as usual, at supper time, to family prayer; when each in rotation repeated his or her verse from the Bible, and all, at the end of their devotions, repeated the hearty 'Amen!' The family in due time retired to rest. The lights were extinguished, and all was quiet. Now the various personal decorations commenced, and all with as little noise as the working of the underground mole. The sensible and anxious lady placed herself at a window, where in darkness she could see all that transpired at the kitchen door.

"Long her patience was exercised, but the grand development now began to unfold. The door was gently opened, when out walked the first couple, arm in arm; Mrs. Susan and Mr. Timothy, and five others closely followed. Miss Sarah, the little scullion, stayed at home (quite contrary to her wishes,) to shut the door after the cavalcade had passed; and also to open it, when needful, provided no drowsy fit overtook her. At the dead of night, or rather early in the morning, the ladies and gentlemen returned, and feebly tapped at the window, which brought the faithful Miss Sarah to the door, when the company entered, and quietly retired to their respective dormitories.

"No scheme of happiness could have been more cautiously contrived, or better executed, but that eye from the dark window spoiled all! The 'sensible lady,' on the next morning, took no notice, and all the servants had the appearance of having enjoyed as good a night's rest as though nothing had happened; each composedly pursuing his or her accustomed avocation. But when the 'sensible lady' reflected that these wicked servants (several of whom were kept chiefly as safeguards to the family) had treacherously deserted their duty, and rendered their mistress (to whom they were under the highest obligations) liable to be despoiled in her property, while at the same time they exposed her, when in fancied security, to be robbed, and even murdered, she saw that prompt and decisive measures must be adopted; and those measures were the following.

"In consultation with other friends, who were summoned to Barley Wood for the occasion, they unitedly disclosed the painful tidings of her worthless servants to poor trembling, aged, Hannah More, and strenuously advised her to quit altogether her little terrestrial paradise! even the house she had built; the gardens she had cultivated; the walks she had arranged; the shrubs and trees she had planted; the temples and cenotaphs she had reared, and the whole endeared by a thousand tender recollections and fond associations. They advised her to call up her native determination, and, from the extreme circumstances of the case, to bid a final adieu to the pre-eminently beautiful place of her abode.

"The words came to Hannah More with the force of a thunderbolt! She preserved silence, while a tear stole down her pallid cheek. At length, with a faltering voice, she said, 'What Susan unfaithful, who has lived with me so many years?' 'Yes!' 'And Timothy, whose relations I have fed and clothed?' 'Yes!' The venerable and afflicted lady continued, 'And Teddy, and Rebecca, and Jane?' 'Yes, all!' 'What!' she continued, 'Not one faithful?' The answer was, 'The whole are faithless!' 'Then,' said the aged Hannah More, 'I will leave it all! Find me a quiet retreat where my few last days may be spent in calmness, prayer, and praise!'

"Having now obtained her consent, Hannah More's friends commenced arrangements for her instant departure. Her eminent and kind physician, Dr. Carrick [she once told me that she had consulted, in the course of her life, through her continued ill health, thirty-seven physicians, all of whom were dead! Dr. Carrick making the thirty-eighth!] looked out for a dwelling at Clifton, and was so happy as to engage a handsomely furnished house, No. 4, Windsor Terrace. The preparations for her departure from Barley Wood having been all completed, the morning of the appointed day arrived, when Hannah More was to take the last survey of the place she loved, and the surrounding prospects, on which her eyes had so long rested with delight! Being afraid to trust her own coachman, a friend sent his carriage from Bristol, to convey her to her Clifton retreat. About a dozen gentlemen, her oldest friends, all, on this morning, assembled at Barley Wood, to defend her, if necessary, from her own servants! These worthless domestics remained in total ignorance of what was going forward. They entertained a gloomy suspicion that a storm was rising, but the cause, and what direction it might take, they knew not.

"It was understood that great altercations had occurred that morning, amongst the domestics in the lower parlour: one accusing the other of treachery, and all denying so foul a breach of honour! Even she who had occasioned the discovery, Miss Teddy, in her fancied innocence, protested that 'The culprit ought to be drowned. 'Twas a downwright wicked thing.'

"The assemblage of so many persons, on this particular morning, united with a guilty conscience, converted apprehension into certainty. Surmise had passed; it was at this moment known that something terrible was about to transpire. The whole of the domestics were now summoned, as criminals, to the drawing-room of their mistress, and, in the presence of all the company, were thus addressed, in a firm tone, by Hannah More. 'You are no longer my servants. By deserting me and my house at midnight, to pursue your revels, you all prove yourselves to be unworthy of my confidence. (after a pause) Your unprincipled conduct has driven me from my home, and forced me to seek a refuge among strangers.' Then rising from her seat, with great dignity, she passed, in silence, by her confounded and speechless servants, without deigning a glance at either. The gentlemen formed a line on either side, through which avenue, with resolutely suppressed feelings, she passed; descending her stairs, not to be retraced! and being conducted tremblingly to her carriage, she closed her eyes, and thought alone on the better inheritance, to which she was so fast hastening.

"It may be subjoined, that the change of residence, so appalling in the anticipation, proved to be a great blessing!

"'For all things *are* less dreadful than they seem.'—Wordsworth.

Mrs. H. More ceased now to feel anxiety about a large establishment of bad and unmanageable servants. Her expences were reduced one half, and her comforts greatly increased. Her carriage, which she never entered (in which Mr. Timothy used to drive out Mrs. Susan for an airing) was sold, with the horses, and what was there for Mrs. H. More to regret? The two rooms she at present personally occupied, were superior to those she had left, and the prospects from them vastly more enlivening. I remember to have called on Hannah More, at her new residence, with the late Rev. Robert Hall, when she discovered a cheerfulness which shewed that Barley Wood was no longer regretted. She brought us to the windows of her spacious drawing-room, and there, in the expanse beneath, invited us to behold the new docks, and the merchants' numerous ships, while the hill of Dundry appeared (at the distance of four miles) far loftier than her own Mendip, and equally verdant. From the window of her back room, also, directly under her eye, a far more exquisite prospect presented itself than any Barley Wood could boast; Leigh Woods, St. Vincent's Rocks, Clifton Down, and, to crown the whole, the winding Avon, with the continually shifting commerce of Bristol; and we left her with the impression that the change in her abode was a great accession to her happiness.

"In a letter to Mr. Wilberforce, Hannah More thus rather pleasantly writes.

"'My very dear friend, "'Windsor Terrace, Oct. 29, 1828.

"'* * * * I am diminishing my worldly cares. I have sold Barley Wood. I have exchanged the eight 'pampered minions,' for four sober servants. As I have sold my carriage and horses, I want no coachman: as I have no garden, I want no gardener. I have greatly lessened my house expences, which enables me to maintain my schools, and enlarge my charities. My schools alone, with clothing, rents, &c., cost me £250 a year.'"

I had not seen, when I drew up the above, the highly-interesting Life of Mr. Wilberforce, just published by his sons; from which it appears that that much-honoured and beloved senator, to whom H. More addressed the letter quoted by Mr. Cottle, was shortly himself subjected to privations, which made it requisite for him, in his latter days, to give up housekeeping, and to become the guest of his children. The following passages will shew the Christian resignation with which, like his congenial friend H. More, he submitted himself to the awards of Divine providence, which, though they might at first appear "not joyous, but grievous;" yet in the end "yielded the peaceable fruit of righteousness;" and not only so—for a bitter cup may be salutary as medicine—but became sweetened and grateful to the taste, so as to be not merely "blessings in disguise," but blessings manifest and acknow-

ledged. The following passages form a suitable accompaniment to the account of H. More, between whom and Mr. Wilberforce there were many points of resemblance, which it is not the object of the present paper to trace out.

"The doubts which hung over the exact powers of the Commissioners still delayed the day of consecration, and it was not until a few days after the death of Mr. Wilberforce that St. Paul's Chapel at Mill Hill was opened for the worship of Almighty God. Whilst this annoying business was in progress, his faith in God was proved by another trial. Though his style of living had always been below his income, he had never accumulated money. He had retrenched his expenses, to give and not to save; and he had given largely and constantly." p. 312.

"He had felt therefore some inconvenience from 'reducing his rents, which were never high, full 37 per cent.' at a time when his family were most expensive to him. His property had been further lessened by his raising a considerable capital, in order to embark his eldest son, whose health appeared unequal to the practice of the law, in a large farming speculation, 'to be actually managed,' as he thought, 'by ———,' a man in whose principles and practical acquaintance with the business he at that time entertained the highest confidence. The event did not confirm his expectations; and in the very month when Mr. Williams's pamphlet (about the chapel) appeared, he found that to secure the remainder of his fortune he must submit to the immediate and very heavy loss of nearly all the capital which had been invested in the business, and retrench greatly on his usual style of living. Yet he was still as free from care as ever, and his 'solitary walk with the Psalmist,' was two days after the full discovery of his loss." pp. 313, 314.

"Through his later years he walked, in an eminent degree, with God, and was literally kept in perfect peace through every trial. Those who lived with him, and marked his unmixed cheerfulness, could scarcely believe that he felt as much on relinquishing in 1831 his house at Highwood, as a letter written at the time implies.

"'My dear ——, Highwood, March 16 (1831).

"'I wished that you should receive from myself, rather than from the tongue of rumour, tidings which sooner or later were sure to be conveyed to you, and which I know would give you pain. The loss incurred has been so heavy as to compel me to descend from my present level, and greatly to diminish my establishment. But I am bound to recognise in this dispensation the gracious mitigation of the severity of the stroke. It was not suffered to take place till all my children were educated, and nearly all of them placed out in one way or another; and by the delay, Mrs. Wilberforce and I are supplied with a delightful asylum under the roofs of two of our own children. And what better could we desire? A kind Providence has enabled me with truth to adopt the declaration of David, that goodness and mercy have followed me all my days. And now, when the cup presented to me has some bitter ingredients, yet surely no draught can be deemed distasteful which comes from such a hand, and contains such grateful infusions as those of social intercourse and the sweet endearments of filial gratitude and affection. What I shall most miss will be my books and my garden, though I own I do feel a little the not (for I know not how long, if ever) being able to ask my friends to take a dinner or a bed with me, under my own roof. And as even the great Apostle did not think the "having no certain dwelling-place," associated with his other far greater sufferings, unworthy of mention, so I may feel this also to be some, though I grant not a great evil, to one who has so many kind friends who will be happy to receive him.'

"His sure confidence was still in God. 'He will not suffer me to be disgraced in my old age. What gives me repose in all things, is the thought of their being His appointment. I doubt not that the same God who has in mercy ordered so many events for so long a course of time, will never fail to overrule all things both for my family and myself.' And on recovering from a temporary illness, 'I can scarce understand,' he said, 'why my life is spared so long, except it be to show that a man can be as happy without a fortune as with one.'

"It should be mentioned to the credit of our times, that by no less than six persons, one of them a West Indian, such private offers were now made to Mr. Wilberforce as would have at once restored his fortune. It was from no false pride that he declined entirely these friendly propositions, thinking it became his Christian character rather to adapt his habits to his present income. Towards his chapel at Mill Hill alone he consented to receive the assistance of his friends; and no less happy in receiving than in showing kindness, he carried always in his pocket, and delighted to produce, a well-worn list of their several contributions." pp. 324—327.

ON THE PREVALENT IGNORANCE AND APATHY AS REGARDS IRELAND—WITH SOME REMARKS ON THE RECENT MURDER OF AUSTIN COOPER, ESQ.

[We hope that we are not among those whose "apathy, as regards Ireland," our much-respected correspondent so justly complains of; but we confess that when we took up his paper, its length, and the general distaste for Irish topics, made us fear that if we inserted it, not a few of our readers would pass it by unnoticed; unless, indeed, the well-known signature affixed to it should induce them to inquire what so able, instructive, and eloquent a writer had to say upon so thread-bare a subject. But if we hesitated before perusal, we assuredly did not after; and our readers would have just cause for reproaching us for more than the average of "apathy" towards Ireland, if we had deprived them of the important reflections in the former part of the paper, or the affecting and certainly not less important details in the latter.]

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

WERE I asked to state the principal cause of the barbarism of Ireland, notwithstanding centuries of contact, or rather collision, with English improvement,—and the principal obstacle to its civilization,—I should, to the first question, answer, POPERY: to the second, the utter ignorance, as to the genius of that enslaving and debasing superstition, and of the real state of Ireland, which exists among our English fellow-subjects. England, by its parliament, legislates for Ireland. England, by its executive, and especially by the functionaries of its Irish department, governs Ireland. The representative of the sovereign, the secretary for Ireland, the commander of the forces, some of our judges, some of our bishops, are English. Of what importance, then, must it not be that those influential functionaries, who, humanly speaking, rule the destinies of Ireland, should see it as it is; and not, by viewing its crimes and miseries through some distorting medium, trace them back to any but their real source, and consequently substitute poisonous stimulants for a wholesome and judicious regimen. English functionaries come over to Ireland animated with liberal feelings and sentiments—I use the word "liberal" in its ancient and honourable sense—sentiments such as become the high-minded people of a free country,—free not only from the tyranny, whether of kings or democrats, but also from the spiritual despotism and mental enslavement of Popery. They prescribe the practical adoption of those principles as the panacea of Ireland's woes; and when they have weakened the hands and depressed the spirit of those who thoroughly know Ireland, and all whose interests are identified with its well-being; and when they have done incalculable mischief, by covering the advances of a treacherous foe, who never retreats, but mans every fortress he has carried, whether by deceit or violence, they look around them, and begin to learn from experience, that their principles, however sound in the abstract, when applied to Irish Roman Catholics prove false and ruinous. They but throw down the needful barriers, and convert the menagerie into a common arena of strife and slaughter for all its inmates. They but throw open the prison doors, and give "liberty and equality" to the murderer and his victim.

If, then, again called upon to state, not only the disease, but also the remedy, I should prescribe for Ireland a visit from every English-

man whose opinion could exercise any influence upon her destiny. Not, observe, a six-weeks-tour, to admire the buildings of Dublin, the beauties of Killarney, the loftiness of our mountains, the extent of our bays and estuaries, lakes and rivers, the richness of our soil, and the poverty of our people; to pay a passing visit to some miserable hovel, be shocked by the destitution, and charmed by the hospitality of its wretched inmates: no; there is no man who forms a more deeply erroneous notion of the state of Ireland than such a cursory visitor—and such are nearly all our visitors—from England. He sees at once, upon the surface of Irish character, those social virtues which are blended with the vices of almost every uncultivated people, and has not time to observe the awful fact, that, with all the volatility of men who act upon the impulse of passion, not of principle, they can, to-day, fawn upon or foster an individual, and murder him to-morrow! He sees every where around him, in the foreground of the landscape, a poverty and wretchedness new to English eyes, and sickening to English feeling; but has not time to observe the melancholy fact, that no increase of pecuniary means can produce an increase of comforts, where drunkenness and debasement act as wolves to carry off all that rises above the bare necessaries to existence; and that if a benevolent landlord or intelligent manufacturer were to make some effort to better the condition of the people, he must calculate upon conflagration of property, and murder of himself or his agents, as among the risks which he may not improbably have to encounter. Statesmen and politicians, when sated with continental travelling, devote a month of their life to Ireland. They are introduced, by their party, to the scenes, and informed of the facts, with suitable comments and explanations, which confirm their preconceived opinions; and carry back, as the rich harvest of this September tour, with specimens of minerals, and spars, and coals, a stock of facts and inferences, and a personal knowledge of Ireland, which serves them for life, and renders them, ever after, inaccessible to all argument and appeal. I know but one class of English visitors favourably circumstanced for attaining correct views of the real state of Ireland—I mean military officers: and I am convinced that committees of parliament would procure more just and solid information from any given number of military men, who had taken their tour of duty through Ireland, and especially if they had served much on detachment, than from the same number of paid commissioners, who had traversed, with that one object, the length and breadth of the land,—who had been heralded by the alarm, and *qui vive?* of party—who could see only through the eyes of prejudiced informants, and, as all who have been brought into contact with them know, were obliged to receive as truths the most false or exaggerated statements, or, at the best, in the most unfair and delusive association;—and, in very many cases, whose chance of knowing as much of the real condition of a district as the most ignorant of its inhabitants, depended upon the collision of party informants (which, for obvious reasons, does not always occur) by which some sparks of truth may have been elicited. But military officers on detachment, standing aloof from all local interests and party prejudices, intelligent observers, and with abundant leisure for observation and reflection, their field of view extended as the land, thoroughly at home in their quarters for an indefinite period, and yet with all the stimulus to observation of a new scene and circumstances, attendants

upon the petty courts of justice, where society appears in undress, and upon the public ministrations of both the Protestant and Roman Catholic clergy (no unimportant agents of good or evil in this distracted land)—they possess every means of forming a correct and comprehensive opinion of the state of Ireland: and I know no class of men who, as far as my experience serves, have come to a more uniform judgment, or in whom that judgment has been more frequently the result of a change from the views which they entertained previous to their visiting Ireland, or which they formed on their first acquaintance with it.

The writer of this article claims for himself no more than this, that his local position furnishes him with abundant opportunity of inspecting the crime and misery of the land. I reside in a remote country parish in the most turbulent and demoralized county in the south of Ireland—a district of which I lately heard an acute and efficient magistrate justly observe, that while other districts had their alternating seasons of quiet and disturbance; while Cork, and Limerick, and Clare, and Kilkenny, had their ebb and flow of crime, the crime of Tipperary was ever at spring tide—ripe with a perpetual harvest. In such quarters I see *Popery* at home, and in undress; for Tipperary, be it well observed, is not merely the "nucleus of crime," but also the strong-hold of Popery; not merely the "*refugium peccatorum*," but also the sanctuary of Irish saints! Here I can look, not only abroad upon effects, but at home upon causes; and see the working of the machinery within. I watch the awful, daily collision of the powers of light and the powers of darkness; and I watch it, like the Alpine traveller, in a region where the electric clouds gather and form around me. Thus circumstanced, I have naturally been led to contemplate, with deep interest, the advantages and deficiencies, the progress and the prospects, of the contending hosts.

That progressively, for the last twenty years, religion has spread in surface and deepened in spirit throughout the Protestant body in Ireland, and most of all among the members of the Established Church, even the most careless observers must perceive, and the most prejudiced admit. A very eminent and devoted minister of our Church put the question, some few years ago, to a pious Methodist preacher, In what denomination of Christians did he conceive that the work of God was most rapidly advancing; and his candid reply was this, That he should, without hesitation, say, among the members, and especially the ministers, of the Established Church. Such an increase of piety, viewed in connexion with the Saviour's promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against His church, might be deemed an abundant security for our Establishment. But I fear otherwise. I do not fear for the *religion* of our Church, but for the permanency of that establishment which has been the nurse of infant reformed Christianity; the rallying standard and the protector, throughout Europe, of mature Protestantism; and the secure refuge from the fierce monster, Popery, of many a pious spirit. For the religion of our Articles and Liturgy I have no fears: it would flourish and bloom amid the dark cells of an inquisition, or the fires of an *auto da fe*. But I fear for the permanency of an establishment which I believe to be an essential barrier against the wide-spreading deluge of Popery, and an indispensable shield to the faithful, of whatever communion, against her persecuting enmity to the saints. And I fear

this, from a contrast, not surely of the religious, but of what may be called the political, spirit of the antagonist hosts. When I contemplate the intenseness of zeal, the unity of object, and the concentration of effort; in a word, the political vitality which pervades Popery throughout the whole frame, from the head and heart to the very extremities: and when I contrast this with the increasing apathy, the increasing divisions, of Protestantism, and the increasing difficulty of discovering any standard to which a force could be rallied sufficient to man the breaches of our assaulted citadel, I seem to hear above the low murmuring of particular discontents with this passage of our liturgy, or that mode of patronage, or state connexion, the loud and indiscriminate shout of Babylon in the day of Jerusalem, "Down with it, down with it, even to the ground."

It is one of the disadvantages under which men of principle contend with the unprincipled, that the ranks of the former must often be thinned by particular conscientious differences, and thus deprived of the powerful aid of many who, in the main, are well-wishers to the general cause. Many good and pious men, who look with horror upon the steady advances of overwhelming Popery; who are faithfully labouring at their respective posts, as spiritual watchmen, and, by eliciting a deeper tone of piety from the Protestant body, are striving to oppose what I do believe would be the most effective counteracting influence, are yet prevented from throwing themselves into the successive breaches of the outworks, not only by their antipathy to the secular and political spirit which this would often imply; but also by their conscientious reluctance against the indiscriminate union, the indiscriminate assault, and indiscriminate defence, which, to be at all effective, is in such cases unavoidable. How far this feeling should be carried, the conscience of each must determine. But, assuredly, it has its limits. Unless the city, like Jerusalem, be abandoned of God, and doomed to destruction, an enemy at the gate would quell the civic jealousies and broils within; and, all lesser differences forgotten in the imminent common danger, its inhabitants would begin, like brethren, to dwell together in unity, and adopt measures for the common defence. So, an assault on the vitals of Christianity would justify the most scrupulous dissentient upon lesser matters, in waving for a time the points at issue, and resorting to the most extended co-operation for its defence. And I confess that, in impatience of the protracted though rapid warfare in which our fortresses are successively carried, while yet no grand assault is made which would rally our full strength to the defence, I have sometimes been tempted to wish—I say it with deep and solemn reverence—that the motley crew of aristocrats and democrats, of monarchists and revolutionists, of Protestants and Papists, infidels and schismatics, of English and mere Irish, who, like the gang of pirates and banditti, are not bound together by any principle, yet, when the end is common, are shackled by no discordant principle in the adoption of the most effectual means, would dare to lay a presumptuous and profane hand upon the *ark* of our religion, that the indwelling spirit might be aroused to crush the infidel host: that they would dare to curtail our faith of some vital truth, or expunge from our liturgy its devotional recognition of the ever blessed Trinity, in order that the piety which now stands upon its arms, or slumbers upon its post, might be awaked to repel such an assailant: that Protestantism might arise, as one man, in the great-

ness of its strength, to kick down the besieger through *this* breach: and that the youthful vigour of our renovated church—all minor differences forgotten, or waived, in the urgency of this vital struggle—might be marshalled, under the uplifted banner of the cross alone, for a decisive effort. But no such assault will, *for a time*, be made; and Protestants will sleep or quarrel. "The children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light." The defences will first be cautiously levelled; the victim will first be robbed of his arms; and then the faith and patience of the saints may be tried, with safety to the assailants, in the furnace of persecution.

But my object is not to speak of the few good men who are kept back from an indiscriminate union, assault, or defence, by the activity of scruple, but of the many who, cordially approving of the Established Church in principle and in detail, and of our political constitution—and, as far as words go, zealous partisans—are kept back from the effective service which such men could accomplish by the *vis inertiæ* of practical apathy. It is notorious that the Houses of Parliament can muster a full force, in any critical emergency, for the work of demolition: that the veteran profligate will select a vacant hour for his assignations, nor suffer the work of destruction to be adjourned for his debauches: while a dinner party, or a race-course, or a covey of partridges, or an anticipated recess, can fatally thin the ranks of those who have volunteered for the defence of our civil and religious institutions. Whether it be that our democratic tail have no more honourable station than their "place in parliament;" no more agreeable lounge than the benches of "the house;" and, there, have every thing to gain; while our conservative aristocrats, with nothing to gain—though no doubt they have something to lose—have more agreeable modes of killing time than by discharging their bounden duty in watching, night after night, over the interests of their constituents, and of their country in general, in the House of Commons: certain it is, that the interests of conservatism have been materially damaged (and especially of late, in the ballot for election committees, which if properly attended to might have turned the balance of parties) by the utter impossibility of getting gentlemen of rank and fortune to compete with the gentlemen of the tail in unwearied attendance upon their parliamentary duties. We may be pardoned in reminding the former, that a seat in parliament is not the object of ambition which it was in the days of England's chivalry: that in the present days, those who cannot submit to the drudgery of regular parliamentary attendance, would best consult their own dignity by not volunteering for it; and that the man whose empty vanity and criminal negligence have conspired to revolutionize his country, and confiscate his own estates, does not sin or suffer in secret, but is gibbeted in every newspaper, to the contempt of men of every party.

The newspapers, some time ago, told us that Mr. Simeon's competitor, in purchasing the patronage of the Bath churches—with a fund, too, subscribed by pious Protestants—was the popish Bishop Baines! I scarcely credit the assertion, though I do not remember to have seen it contradicted. But should not the bare suspicion of this insolent defiance; should not the mere hint of the possibility of such a catastrophe as would have been the success of such an effort; have rallied the spirit of Protestant England, and quickly filled Mr. Simeon's coffers with ample funds, adequate to secure to the *whole* of the corporation livings in

England what, amid all our theorizing upon the advantages and disadvantages—for there are both—of state connexion, would be the best conceivable patronage? If it did not, was it the poverty, but not the will, refused? Nay; England knows not how to dispose of her overflowing capital. Was it want of Christian benevolence? No; England ever answers such an appeal, as lately in the case of the Irish Clergy, and the famishing Scotch Highlanders, with the most magnificent generosity. But there is an apathy, or a discord, in all that concerns the defence of our civil and ecclesiastical constitution, which I cannot but view as the most awful among the signs of the times; and as the infallible precursor of the successful inroads of anarchy, the dead calm which but precedes the whirlwind, that will shortly level, in one common ruin, the most sacred and ancient edifices of the British empire.

If, then, it be asked what plan have I to propose, I answer, None: Of plans there is no dearth in the present day. Our civil and ecclesiastical establishments are withering; not from any lack of plans for their security and improvement, but from a want of that harmony and zeal, without which no plans can be successful. I desire not to meddle with details, but to inculcate a principle; not to prescribe for symptoms, but to invite attention to the seat of disease. I ask men to look around them, and within them, and to say whether apathy, as regards the interests of Protestantism, does or does not exist; and if it does, calmly to consider what must be the end thereof. I have alluded to a few of the symptoms in England, and will now point to a few others with which we in Ireland are more directly concerned. And first, the little encouragement, not to say positive discouragement, of Protestant tenants by the Protestant landlords of Ireland, who are, in fact, the sole proprietors of the soil; and the little desire evinced by the Protestant gentry, not to say the positive unwillingness, to employ Protestant servants: both, effects of the same cause, a timid reluctance against encountering annoyance and unpopularity in these liberal days, by an overt act of patronage to Protestantism. Thus, while Protestants of every grade, but especially of the lower classes, have for the last twenty years been sinking with a continually accelerating rapidity in the social scale, or have been driven by persecution on the one hand, and neglect upon the other, to seek amid the snowy wastes of Upper Canada, or the sands of New Holland, independence, security, and peace—blessings denied them by their wealthy Protestant brethren in the pleasant vales, or even amid the moors and mountains, of their father land: during that period many a Protestant estate has been let and relet, without any increase of its Protestant tenantry; nay, with a systematic exclusion of Protestants, for peace sake! And there is at this moment many a Protestant family in which, from the same cause, not a single Protestant domestic of either sex is to be found. The places of both are filled—the one by the sworn members of a lawless and blood-stained faction, to whom drunkenness is a second nature, fighting a pastime, and murder a trade; and who are connected with their landlords by no bond, except it be the truly Irish bond of reciprocal fear: the other, by domiciliary spies upon the actions of their employers; and reporters, at the confessional, of the private conversations of themselves and their guests, to an ambitious, crafty, and dangerous priesthood, who well know how to wield this tremendous weapon, who

"Scire volunt secreta domus, ac inde timeri."

The effect of this compromise and conciliation has been, to convert our once respectable Protestant population into a community of paupers; and, as paupers, I point to their destitute and neglected state. Why should there, I ask, be a single Protestant, at least in the south of Ireland, in poverty, unless tied and bound to it by the chain of his sins? Contrast the small proportion of the poor with the large proportion of the wealthy members of our church in the south of Ireland; contrast the pittance which would abundantly minister to the necessities of the one, with the resources of the other—that is, with the income of the land; and tell me, without referring it to the apathy of Protestants, why there should be no pauper among the Society of Friends, and many a one in the communion of the Established Church in Ireland.

I had written the above when interrupted by one of those fearful thunder-claps, not unfrequent in this turbid and disorganized region; but which, if strangers to it had eyes to see and ears to hear, would dispel the darkness of ignorance as regards the real state of Ireland, and disturb the slumbers of apathy. My attention had been drawn to the subject of the preceding pages, by the strange procedure and issue of the assizes for this county, which had just terminated; and by the gloomy forebodings to which these gave birth. Between the preceding assizes and the last, several murders had been committed in this one county, as the mangled bodies of the victims undeniably testified. At the last assizes eighty individuals were arraigned at the bar of judgment, on the awful charge of depriving a fellow man of life; or, to adopt the learned judge's more technical description, "eighty charged with murder; or aiding or abetting in murder, which is the same." That is, in one county, and at one assizes, nearly twice the number charged with the same awful crime in all England and Wales, for the entire year! Such was one page from the annals of Tipperary! one extract from its calendar of crime! The assizes commenced with the charge of the criminal judge (Moore), of which no faithful paraphrase would be credited. I shall therefore give one extract in his own words, as reported by the press:—"*Gentlemen, this is a peculiar county. It is looked upon as an alarmed world, but I assert that it is an excellent population; that it has a noble gentry, who hold fine places, and can live comfortably and happily in those places. It is not the 'refugium peccatorum.' No: it is not the nucleus of crime which it is represented.*"

So the assizes commenced. They closed, as from such a commencement might reasonably have been expected, in a county where jurors, if they did their sworn duty, would have more to fear than now have murderers; and where most of them are glad, some through fear, more through favour, to avail themselves of any salvo of conscience and character which will justify them to themselves and to the public in clearing the guilty,—they closed without a single capital conviction! Justice, at what impulse I know not, or how paralysed, has dropped the balance and the sword. The manes, unappeased, of many murdered victims of anarchy and party, hover over the affrighted land—seem to moan in every hollow gust, and send a thrill of shivering horror through the frame, as they meet us, each in the fatal spot of his bloody death struggle, at every lonely turn in the highways of this Aceldama*.

---

* Aware of the degree to which any vagueness in a statement weakens its impression, I detained the above till the 18th of April, in the hope that I

The blood of many murdered victims, unheard by the "dull, cold ear of" justice, with stifled voice crieth unto heaven from the ground, for vengeance on this guilty land. A murmur—loud or low, as fear permits—sounds throughout this outraged county, in every quarter, and from every decent individual. The more orderly Roman Catholics, even of the humblest class, shudder and express their alarm when they hear of various murders and no murderer—as though the destroying angel had passed, with a promiscuous slaughter, through our sleeping host; or sometimes, as of old in Egypt, with nice discrimination selected the first-born—the chief of all our strength: when they hear of eighty prejudged innocents, most of whom they know

---

might be enabled to fill, with figures, blanks which are now occupied with the words "many," "several," "various." But I found it impossible to ascertain, from any source on which I could rely with confidence, the precise number of homicides in the county of Tipperary between the summer assizes of 1837 and the spring assizes of 1838. The secret of Irish crime, and especially of Tipperary crime, is so faithfully kept by the "tranquillizers of Ireland," its safe depositories (I must not say effective instigators and accomplices), that, unless when parliament interposes, no authentic information can be obtained. Since the 18th of April, when I forwarded the above to the Christian Observer, a return of the *committals* for crime in Ireland during the year 1837 has been published by order of the House of Commons, pursuant to the Act of 56 George III., c. 120. But as it is considered that in Ireland, generally, committals bear to crimes the ratio of one to six, and in lawless Tipperary a far lesser proportion, this document can furnish but a faint conception of the meaning which should be attached to the vague terms "many," "several," "various," which I have been reluctantly compelled to use.

From this parliamentary document it appears, that in the year 1837 the *committals* for *murder* in all Ireland, *exclusive of Tipperary*, were 445; for manslaughter, 149: that in *Tipperary alone* the *committals* for *homicide*—for the Tipperary returns afford no means of distinguishing between murders and manslaughters; these are, in the *Tipperary returns*, huddled together—shall we say with the benevolent view that by mystifying the returns of "the murder county," as it is styled by some—"the Popish county," by others—"a peculiar county," by a third high authority,—public feeling may not be shocked with the awful preponderance of the higher crime?—in *Tipperary alone*, the *committals* for homicide, in 1837, amount to 124!—that is, to more than one sixth of the committals for homicide in all Ireland! and exceeding, by 13, the number for the ten northern Protestant counties!

I extract from the Standard newspaper the following remarks on the returns to parliament:—"In order to observe the progress of Irish crime, it is necessary to take a term: we shall therefore begin with the year 1823, as giving a repetition of the convenient and customary cycle of seven years:—

Committals for Crimes.

1823—Tory mis-government ...	14,623
1830—Do. do.	15,749
1837—Mulgrave tranquillity ...	27,396
An increase upon the first period of	1,162
An increase upon the second period of	11,602

An aggravation tenfold of the rate of progress in the respective cycles.

"But the horrible rapidity of advance will be most clearly seen by comparing the last two years:—

	Crimes.	*Hom.*
1836	23,891...	620
1837	27,398...	722
An increase in one year of	3,505...	102

"This increase of homicides too is all in the murder class—for the committals for murders in 1836 were stated at 340; and in 1837 they are, exclusive of Tipperary, 453; and in that county—the return from which artfully confounds homicides—there were ten murderers convicted, making certainly 463 committals for that crime."

I ought not, perhaps, to have used, even figuratively, so heathenish a phrase as "appeasing the manes" of these victims; but assuredly, in the language of Holy Writ itself, blood crieth from the ground; earth cannot cover it, or darkness hide it; and the retributive vengeance of the Most High will not finally sleep, either as respects the agents, the abettors, or those whose criminal supineness facilitated, if not encouraged, its effusion.

to be murderers—for about the perpetrator there is no secret among the people, and those who have heard the evidence, say, there could, in many instances, be little in the court—turned loose upon society, many of them upon the county, to itinerate as walking placards of a government proclamation that rewards offered for the conviction of murderers are merely old-fashioned and unmeaning forms: that, in Tipperary, killing is no murder, or at least murder is no crime: and, as is inculcated and believed by many, that "the Queen has given her hand and word to Shiel and Cave that there shall be no more hanging in Tipperary." Considering all these things, I wrote the preceding pages with a strong sympathy in the general apprehension, that our Spring assizes had sown the serpent's teeth, which would speedily mature into a bristling array of armed men, and that the scythe of death would reap among us a bloody harvest.

My worst fears have already commenced to be realized. On the morning of Thursday, the 5th of April, between the hours of seven and eight, within a mile of his own home; and not, I believe, three miles from the most distant of the scenes rendered memorable by the murders of Mr. Baker, Mr. Long, Mr. Going, Mr. Chadwich, Mr. Whitty, and many others of lesser note; on the high road, and from behind the fence, Austin Cooper, Esq., of Kilmore, was barbarously murdered by four (as is supposed) hired assassins: Mr. Wayland, a gentleman who, with Mr. Cooper's brother, accompanied him, dangerously wounded, and his horse shot under him: and these fatal shots responded to by the fire of a party posted on a parallel road which Mr. Cooper sometimes travelled to Tipperary. But murder is so common in this "refugium peccatorum," as, in despite of Judge Moore's judicial decision *within the last three weeks*, we must style this "peculiar county,"—drunk with blood, that to make a case which will justify our exclamation of horror, we must tell of *this* murder, *what the cause*, and *who the victim*.

Mr. Cooper was agent to the Board of Erasmus Smith's endowment, and to the See of Cashel. After unexampled forbearance and indulgence, he felt compelled, by a sense of duty to his employers, to dispossess some tenants—not, as he himself told me, unable, but unwilling, to fulfil their obligations; and who, emboldened by the anarchy of the county, and the recent murder in their neighbourhood of an agent who had dared to eject, refused every offer at compromise. They found to their surprise, that in honest hands the law could be vindicated; that Mr. Cooper, though a lamb in gentleness and feeling, was a hero in principle, and would, at whatever personal risk, dare to do his duty. The refractory tenants, to their amazement, were actually ejected. A price—and it was a poor one; but murder is cheap in the training-school of the assassins—was set upon his forfeit life. He received several of those private warnings of which the public knows nothing, and the authorities of the present day care nothing; but which render this county, we must again say, notwithstanding Judge Moore's late judicial decision, "an alarmed world." One of his hired assassins had been some time ago transported for another crime; and, previous to the last assizes, he had reason to believe that the spirit of the conspiracy was broken. In the open simplicity of an honest and generous heart, which would not believe that the Irish peasant is forgetful only of favours; and that the affectionate gentleness, past and present, of a whole life could not atone for one transgression

of that mob-rule which is the *de facto* law of this demoralized land,—himself too forgetful of that stimulant to crime which, however unintentional, had but lately emanated from the seat of justice, he confided in those whom superstition had unlearned, if I may adopt a needful phrase, even the virtues of nature, and paid the penalty of this error —death. This was the head and front of his offending. But *who was the victim?*

Austin Cooper was—and I use both terms emphatically—the most *amiable* of *Christians*. I have known amiable men without the leaven of holiness. I have known Christian men in whom one wished to see more, not only of the meekness and gentleness of Christ, but of those bland, unselfish, softer characters, which even nature can sometimes produce. But Austin Cooper was cast in nature's finer mould, and of her better clay; and grace adopted this fine subject as its own, and stamped it with the image of God. His was not a religion of mere forms, or florid professions, but rich in various, ripe, and precious fruit. Not merely exemplary, but tenderly affectionate in all the domestic relations, as father, husband, son, and brother; a steady friend; in the midst of accumulated and toilsome business, ever ready to step aside, at the call of friendship or the cry of want, and, without bustle or parade, to become the servant of all men to whom his services could be really beneficial. Generous and unselfish towards his dependents; munificent in his direct charities; upright, liberal, and considerate, in his manifold transactions of business; there was in his whole intercourse and demeanour a meekness and humility, and in his very countenance and address—as in those of his late murdered pastor, Irwine Whitty—a placid calm, an unsuspecting confidence, and a winning sweetness, which facts alone could prove must not have disarmed even the hired assassin. An active promoter of every charitable and pious work, his house had for many years been a station of the Home Mission*. Of a temperament eminently domestic and retiring, he yet

* For the information of some of our readers, our correspondent should have explained that the Home Mission Society in Ireland is not like that which bears the same name in London—a Dissenting institution;—but is carried on by members of the Episcopal communion, through clerical agency, under the sanction of some of the prelates of the Irish Church. The late Archbishop Magee was a warm friend of the Society, and is said to have remarked to the following effect: —"Go and preach to the people in churches; and if you cannot get churches, in school-houses or barns; and if you cannot get these, beside hedges or in ditches." An important cause arising out of the proceedings of Mr. Nixon, a beneficed clergyman, who had preached in the market-place in the parish of another clergyman in another diocese, against his will, without permission of the bishop or the incumbent, has just been decided. There has been much warfare in Ireland between bishops and clergymen, some of the latter claiming to preach wherever they think right; and some of the former not allowing even an occasional ministration without the express sanction of the bishop. We think that the ecclesiastical judge, Dr. Miller, has decided the question judiciously and correctly, in saying that one clergyman may, by custom, and for convenience, occasionally assist another without being specially licensed for that purpose by the bishop of the diocese. We think, however, that the latter part of his judgment fails, in that he makes out the gravamen of the charge against Mr. Nixon to be, not that he preached in another clergyman's parish without his permission, but that he

felt as a privilege, what all must view as a serious derangement of the domestic economy, the throwing open his house as an hotel, his offices as public stables, and his dining-room as a chapel, that on every alternate Thursday a minister of his own church, to which he was devotedly attached, might there proclaim the unsearchable riches of

---

preached in an unauthorized place; which decision goes to prohibit not merely the itinerancy of the Home Mission, but the delivery of cottage lectures by a clergyman in his own parish. It is not, however, our business to settle the construction of the Irish canons; for even in England the question is settled rather by obvious necessity, utility, and duty, than by severe legal arguments; so that while intrusion and other irregularities are guarded against, full scope is given to a minister's pastoral labours in his own allotted sphere of obligation.

The following are a few of Dr. Miller's remarks upon pulpit jurisdiction:—

"It is contended that the preacher may be changed indefinitely, at the discretion of the incumbent or curate, without making any reference to his ecclesiastical superior, and with no other limitation than that the stranger should have been regularly ordained. It is obvious that such a liberty might be extended so far as to render the local charge of a particular congregation, and the licence of a bishop, committing it to an individual, little more than empty forms. Yet, if it be a matter of strict and absolute right, how can it be restrained? I freely admit, indeed, that the occasional assistance which clergymen mutually afford, in cases of necessity, and even an occasional interchange of duty for mere convenience, both which have been long practised without reprehension, are not only demanded for the accommodation of ministers, but even beneficial to their congregations; who, in the one case, might also be deprived of the benefits of divine service, and even in the other may derive some advantage from the opportunity of hearing a variety of preachers. This practice, as it has heretofore prevailed, I am far from wishing to abridge. But the present question does not relate to a practice restrained within the limits of necessity, or of occasional convenience. It concerns a claim of an abstract right, which, if it exist at all, may be pushed to an extent excluding almost all subordination to ecclesiastical authority."

"In support of this pretension, reliance appears to have been chiefly placed on the judgment pronounced by Sir John Nicholl, in the case of Gates *v.* Chambers, in the Arches Court of Canterbury, in the year 1824. But what was this case, as reported in 2 Adams? It was that of a single performance of duty by a curate of the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry, at the request of the rector of a parish in the neighbouring diocese of Peterborough, then absent in attendance upon a sick wife. The judge, in disposing of this case, said, 'that occasional assistance so given is punishable as an ecclesiastical offence, merely because the minister, so assistant, has not been licensed, as curate, by the bishop of the diocese, is more than, without further consideration, and other authorities being adduced, I am prepared to lay down as the rule of law; such a rule would be highly inconvenient to the clergy, and might not unfrequently occasion parishioners to be deprived altogether of the church's service.' The case, therefore, was one of urgent necessity, which appeared to have occurred only in a solitary instance: and the judge appears rather to have dismissed the complaint on a consideration of the inconvenience which the strict enforcement of the law would impose both upon the clergy and upon their parishioners, than to have pronounced that it was averse to the acknowledged law of the church."

"Another authority has also been adduced, which is entitled to much respect, being understood to be an opinion given by Dr. Phillimore two years afterwards. 'I apprehend,' says this opinion, as reported in the Christian Observer for March 1836, 'that a bishop has no authority to prevent any incumbent, within his diocese, from admitting into the pulpit of his church any regularly ordained minister of the Established Church not resident within his diocese, from preaching an occasional sermon in any church within his diocese, provided he has the sanction of the incumbent of that church for so doing.' Nor am I disposed to dissent from this opinion, if by an occasional sermon be understood only a sermon preached in the course of that reciprocal accommodation, which the parochial clergy have long been in the habit of giving and receiving, and the bishops of allowing. In this sense only the civilian appears to have used the words."

"The liberty of the pulpit consists, I conceive, in an exemption from all control

Christ, and preach to a large, a most respectable and attentive, and, I trust, a seriously benefited congregation, that Gospel which was designed to bring "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men."

I cannot forbear adducing it as a striking proof of the excellent spirit of the departed, that the deep regret for this victim of anarchy, and the cordial sympathy for his bereaved family and connexions, which pervade every class throughout the country—*that* excepted which perpetrated the crime—are unmingled with cries of vengeance. It is not that the most effectual means have not been, and will not be, adopted to vindicate the outraged law. On the contrary, this murder has produced a shock deep and universal as when Mr. Baker or Mr. Whitty fell, and has awakened the county to a sense of its real condition. His funeral was followed by a large meeting of magistrates and gentry, who, it is to be hoped, will themselves assume, as far as constitutionally may be, the reins of its government; which, from factious motives, have, for some time, been suffered to drop into the hands of the vilest and most turbulent class of its population: but what I mean is this, that the deep and universal feeling, on this occasion, seems to repose in tender regrets upon the victim, rather than to rise, in ebullitions of vengeance, against the murderers. It is as though the mantle of charity which clothed his meek spirit, had, in his translation, dropped upon his mourners: and though

> "—Grief will have way, yet the fast falling tear
> Is *not* mingled with deep execrations on those"

who, at the impulse of cold-blooded revenge and filthy lucre, could heartlessly rob a wife of an affectionate husband, four infant babes of a tender parent, society of one of its brightest ornaments, and the church below of one of her most faithful sons. This meekness and tenderness of sorrow I view as a reflection of the spirit of the departed, just as the soft glow of autumn's evening landscape but reflects the mild lustre of a brightly setting sun. Man's immortal principle, which "startles at destruction," instinctively looks back to its last personal intercourse with any individual who has been suddenly cut down—thus forward to his eternal destiny: and, in the instance before us, all the recollections thus revived, peaceful as their object; and every glance which follows him beyond the veil, bright and glorious as that destiny, repel every dark and discordant feeling. Among many interesting anecdotes of this character, which may more properly be recorded in the hearts of friends, and in the book of God's remembrance, than in the pages of a periodical, the following is stated to have been his last act.—As he stepped into his gig, on the fatal morning, a woman

---

previous to the act of preaching; the sermon, however, when delivered, becoming then subject to the prescriptions of the known laws of the Church. Attempts have been made, doubtless from the best and purest motives, by individual bishops of both countries, to impose on their clergy some more specific restrictions in regard to doctrines which are thought to be ambiguously, or at least indistinctly, determined in the Articles. These attempts have been successfully resisted, and it is right that they should be opposed as invasions of the liberty of the pulpit, because individual bishops are not competent to narrow the limits of doctrine prescribed by the public authority of the church. The preacher should go into the pulpit free to preach the Gospel of Christ, in correspondence only to the Articles, to which he was bound at his ordination. This is the true independence of the pulpit; not a liberty which would almost supersede all superintendence, by an indefinite change of the individuals to be controlled."

applied to him for medicine, which he was in the constant habit, amid the multiplicity of his engagements, of himself distributing to the poor. Though in haste, he immediately returned to his office, and supplied her want; and before she could have left his grounds was himself in eternity. That woman was a spy!! And shortly before he started, two men were observed to proceed at a rapid pace, and under suspicious circumstances, in the direction of his murderers, from the vicinity of his house. Thus, some recal solid benefits conferred on them; others, the affectionate look, or kind expression, with which he last parted from them. The perfect freedom too of his death, under such circumstances, from every thing painful and terrific (the medical attendant's opinion is, that he probably never even heard the shot which emancipated his spirit) and the well-grounded confidence of his friends that their loss is his unspeakable gain—all these cause them to "sorrow not as those who have no hope." These elevating and soothing recollections embalm his memory, and shroud from shocking and irritating view his mangled corpse.

In a former Number of the Christian Observer for this year, I related an interesting anecdote of Mr. Whitty, a few evenings previous to his murder; mentioned to me, as I there stated, at the scene of its occurrence, a happy Christian fire-side. It can be no breach of delicacy to say, *that* scene was the house of Mr. Austin Cooper's father, and that I have every reason to believe that Mr. Austin Cooper himself was present on the occasion alluded to. And it may present Ireland to your readers in a striking point of view to remark, that of the *three* gentlemen who joined the drawing-room circle that evening, *two*, wholly unconnected by family or business, at different times, for different causes, by different persons, and those, probably, persons who never before had any contact, collision with, or even knowledge of them, have been murdered! It is truly an awful link by which my present is connected with my former paper.

Let me add one fact more. I could name a truly pious lady in this county, whose father was murdered! whose brother-in-law was murdered! whose cousin-german, by marriage, was murdered! the pastor of whose parish was murdered! the pastor of the parish adjoining to whose residence was murdered! two other pastors of parishes adjoining to whose residence were fired at, and *in intention* murdered! whose husband was fired at, and *in intention* murdered! whose brother, because an upright and spirited magistrate, was fired at, and *in intention* murdered! Now observe, that this was not an entertainment provided for some unpopular family party. These five actual murders, though thus connected with a single individual, were of parties perfectly distinct; at different times, and for different causes. So many murders, actual and attempted, accumulated round the home and heart of a single individual, must present this "peculiar county" in an awfully striking point of view to English "gentry, who hold fine places, and can live comfortably and happily in those places." And as I now review this "peculiar county," I do not think I should speak rashly were I to assert, that there is not in it a single respectable family, which has not had a relative, a friend, a neighbour, or some person connected with it in business, murdered!

When we contemplate two such men as Mr. Whitty and Mr. Cooper, such a pastor, and such a parishioner, not parted by three miles, in their homes, and in their death scenes, both so truly amiable,

so unaffectedly pious, so respected, and so beloved; and when we contrast their peaceful and beneficent lives with their violent and cruel deaths, one is tempted to exclaim, with mingled horror at the crime and compassion for the deluded perpetrators, who "know not what they do," "How long, O Lord, Holy and true!" How long shall be the duration of this reign of anarchy and misrule? How long shall our country be viewed but as an arena of combat, on which political parties may struggle for place and power, surrounded by the desolation and misery of its people? How long shall the powers of darkness rule in the cruel habitations of this benighted land, and the revelation of God's will, and the light of God's countenance, be withheld from it? How long shall it be the cry of our demoralized people, when some holy man of God is sent among them, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live?" How long shall those who walk with God be translated?

J. M. H.

THE REV. J. KELLY ON THE LAST DAYS OF MR. KNOX.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN your last Number I have read a short but interesting letter respecting my statement about Mr. Knox's change of mind on the subject of the sinner's justification: and the perusal of it has brought to my mind a letter which I wrote some time ago, intending to send it to the "Christian Observer" for publication; but which I laid by, under the apprehension that I was saying too much upon a subject in which I myself was personally involved. That letter contained a copy of a communication, which I received from a Christian friend, on the subject of Mr. Knox's change of mind; which appeared to me of an important character, but which, for the reason above mentioned, I did not send. The appearance of the letter in your last, subscribed "An Anglican," has made me think it better for me to send you the communication in question, and leave it to your own judgment either to insert it or not. It is as follows:—

"Having heard, on my coming to Dublin, of some letters that have passed between you and Mr. Hornby, relative to the change in Mr. Knox's opinions in the last years of his life; and being able to say something on those opinions, from personal interviews with Mr. Knox: knowing his opinions for fifteen years before his death, and hearing him express his opinions only three years before it, I think it may be well to put you in possession of what his religious sentiments were, as expressed to me at the time of his illness, about three years before his death, and when he expected to die; at least he said he thought he should." My friend goes on to speak of Mr. Knox's views as they had been, which for brevity sake I omit. He then proceeds as follows:—

"On my visiting him after his illness, about three years before his death, he expressed to me the change that had passed in his mind on the subject. Among other things of the same tendency, he said, He wished as a child to look to the blood of Christ, as that by which he might find peace with God. Twice or thrice he spoke of the blood of Christ received as a child, in connection with his acceptance and peace with God. I was the more struck with it, because I had never known

him so to express himself before; and I told him so. He had often spoken of righteousness and holiness to me; but I never knew him to speak of receiving, as a child, the blood of reconciliation, by which, and not by wisdom or righteousness, peace might be found with God. I cannot be mistaken as to the change of his mind and views in this matter. How long or how short a time this had been working in his mind, or whether his illness, and, as he then thought, the probable termination of his life, brought it about, I cannot say; but of the fact I am certain. I stated it to Mr. Knox at the time, expressing my great thankfulness to God for it; and, from my expression of thankfulness for his change, he made no dissent. On my leaving my dear old friend, I spoke that very hour to a friend of mine on the change. That friend is now no more. The change, I believe, consisted in this; in having his mind humbled, to receive by faith the blood of Jesus, as his only hope of salvation; instead of looking to his being made righteous, as that which led to his acceptance."

Such is the letter. My friend begged that I would not mention his name; and I am therefore under the necessity of sending it simply with my own attestation as to the competence of the writer in the capacity of a witness on the subject. Such I certainly do consider him, independent of any connection his testimony has with the question at issue between Mr. Hornby and myself. When I wrote my letter to you in July, 1836, I was not aware of any individual in the world, except the late Doctor Cheyne, having the same opinion as myself respecting the change in Mr. Knox's mind. I now find, that there are no fewer than seven of his friends, who had come to the same conclusion as myself on the subject. The names of four are before the public. The fifth is the writer of the letter copied above. The sixth is a person whose name was mentioned in Mr. Scott's letter to Mr. Hornby,—the name of a person whose testimony would have no small weight. And the seventh is a lady who does not like to have her name publicly mentioned, but who has told me that she had had different conversations latterly with Mr. Knox, all leading to the same conclusion that I had come to respecting the change in his religious views.

I am, &c. THOMAS KELLY.

*** We are much obliged to Mr. Kelly, and think he has no need to trouble himself about further corroborations. If Mr. Hornby is not yet convinced, we think most other persons will be. We may add, that the much-lamented death of our beloved friend, Mr. Macaulay, (which this is not the place to touch upon even in a parenthesis) allows us to state, while the facts are fresh in memory, that he was our informant in the statement that Mr. Knox declared that the atonement of Christ had no place in his system. Mr. Macaulay said that he had the words from his own lips, and he was not a man to mistake in such a matter. Mr. Knox, who was fond of paradox, did not perhaps intend all that the words convey; he perhaps meant that the atonement was available for baptismal justification; but that henceforth it was personal holiness, and not righteousness or obedience unto the death of Christ, that wrought out salvation. We rejoice to think that at last it was not on himself, but on his Saviour, that he placed his hopes for eternity.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

WORKS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Bishop of London's Sermon; Rev. H. Melvill's; Central Society's Publications; Rev. R. Burgess; and House of Commons Report.

(*Concluded from page* 270.)

WE trespassed so largely in our April Number with our own opinions upon the overwhelmingly important subject of National Education, that we were obliged to postpone our intended quotations from the publications before us. Lest we should thus offend a second time, we will proceed at once to extract some passages; for the subject is so large and so momentous, that it is easier to begin than to end in remarking upon it. The plans proposed by the Central Education Society and their numerous abettors, are directly infidel; for they banish Christianity from the public seminaries; and we might even have said that they are atheistical, for they propose to educate the whole population "without God in the world"—at least in the world of their schools. Lord Brougham's Bill proposes that the Holy Scriptures shall be admitted and made a regular part of school reading; but as it takes away the management of the institutions both from clergymen and Dissenting ministers, and gives overwhelming influence over them to a central board of commissioners, there is no guarantee for due attention being paid to this enactment, at least beyond the slightest use which will satisfy the letter of the law. We never could see any medium between abandoning the scheme altogether, and connecting popular education with the Established Church, as is done in Scotland and other countries. The principles inculcated with so much ability and eloquence by Dr. Chalmers, apply as forcibly to state education as to a state church. Religion must not be dispensed with; the Scriptures must be read, and not only read but unfolded and impressed upon the understandings and consciences of the children; prayer must be offered; and how is all this to be secured nationally but in one defined course and order, and by one uniform agency? This is our fixed persuasion; but for the purpose of argument in the present paper we will say nothing of the catechism of any particular church, but put the case on the broadest ground of scriptural education. Let us only agree that this is indispensable; and it is easily proved that it must be conveyed through the agency of the Established Church, the system of voluntaryism being wholly inadequate to the end.

We take up, first, the Bishop of London's Sermon, not only in deference to his lordship's elevated station both as a legislator and an ecclesiastical governor, but also for its powerful arguments and very important statements, as well in regard to facts as principles. His Lordship speaks as follows of his reasons for publishing his discourse, and in so doing renews his protest against non-religious education.

"The following Sermon is published at the request of several persons, who were present when it was preached. I have the more readily complied with that request, because an opportunity is thereby afforded me of renewing, as a minister of the Church, the protest which I have already made, as a member of the Legislature, against all attempts to introduce into this country a system of general education, which excludes, or omits, all direct instruction in the Bible.'

"Upon the occasion to which I allude, I stated, that the introduction of such a system was contemplated by a Society, which calls itself the 'Central Society of Education.' In answer to this statement it was alleged, that no such object was avowed by the Society in any of its rules, or official publications; in reply to which allegation I remarked, that whether that object were avowed, or not, it was undoubtedly aimed at by the Society; inasmuch as the sentiments, which its leading members, those who are in fact the managers and conductors, or the agents and advocates of the Society, entertain on this head, are matters of notoriety, having been proclaimed by them both in print and at public meetings. But the truth is, that the Society does, in its own publications, recommend, that religious instruction should be entirely separated from the regular course of instruction in our schools, and left, not to the schoolmaster, nor to any common teacher, but to the respective ministers of the different sects to which the parents of the children belong, in case they should be disposed to undertake the task. This has been so clearly shown by Mr. Dunn, that nothing further need be said in proof of it.

"Against this Society, which argues for the exclusion of religion from the regular intellectual instruction of schools, intended for those classes to which a knowledge of religion is especially valuable, I here repeat my protest; and I should be justified in doing so, even without reference to the acknowledged opinion of one of its leading members, (Mr. Simpson in his Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1835, Nos. 3171, 3180,) that 'the idea of basing education upon doctrinal religion is an utter absurdity,' and that the arrangement, which wholly shuts out the Bible from what he terms the secular school,' is a '*sine qua non* to a general system of national education.'"

The following statement, from so high an authority, holds out some consolation under the threatened infliction; but it does not diminish the necessity for strong and united resistance to the proposed measure:—

"Neither the Central Society, nor the Government itself, were it disposed to make the attempt, (which I do not believe to be the case,) could succeed in forcing upon the people of this country such an education as the former contemplates. I entirely agree in opinion with Mr. Dunn, when he says, 'I am stating the sentiments of thirty-nine fortieths of the religious portion of the community: and it is on this ground I hold, that for the present ministry to sanction any system of national education, in which a Bible class should not form part of the daily intellectual instruction of the school, under the schoolmaster, would be to commit an act of political suicide.' But I go further than this, and venture to say, in which I fear Mr. Dunn will not agree with me, that no system of education can be forced upon the people at large, which shall not be in conformity with the principles of the Church of England, and worked by its instrumentality. It will be our own fault if it be otherwise."

His Lordship is far from maintaining that the present education in national schools is perfect, either as respects its intellectual or spiritual efficiency; and we think that he could not do a greater service to his country than to have the causes and the cure fully ascertained. We have for many years urged the necessity of such an inquiry; our own solution has always been that the fault rests chiefly in the appointment of the masters. Some religious men bring forward masters who fear God, but cannot teach; others, less piously disposed, patronize clever teachers who do not fear God. The Society ought in every instance to make full inquiry into both these particulars; and to deal in the most faithful manner with the managers of schools who send persons to learn the system.

The bishop states that the true method of conducting religious education, so as neither to compromise principle nor to incur the risk of dissension, is, that the great bodies of different religious persuasions should each have their own schools; but if in any small parish those who dissent from the Established Church are not numerous enough to have a school of their own, it is too much to require that the Established Church

should forego the inculcation of its own doctrines, because there are a few persons who dislike them.

His Lordship devotes a considerable portion of his discourse to an examination of the following points;—namely,

"Whether, as believers in the Gospel ourselves, we are at liberty to promote any scheme of education, which omits instruction in the truths and precepts of that Gospel; or whether it be not our bounden duty, to make such instruction the basis, and essential part of the whole system; the one thing indispensable; that, which may on no account be passed over, nor treated as a matter of secondary moment, whatever other branches of knowledge may be dispensed with."

The following are among his Lordship's arguments on these points:—

"We are desirous of expanding, cultivating, storing the mind: but we are more solicitous about the training and preparation of the soul, by methods of God's own appointment. We bear in remembrance, that man is not only an intellectual being, but a moral agent; that he has passions to be tamed, and affections to be regulated, and purified, as well as faculties to be sharpened: that conscience is of more value than memory; that it is of unspeakably greater moment to himself, and others, that he should be taught the principles of Christian faith and duty, that he should be imbued with holy and charitable feelings, that he should be formed to habits of virtue and industry, than that he should be enabled to penetrate the secrets of nature, enriched with the varied treasures of literature, or skilled in the mechanical arts. We remember, that man was originally placed in this world, to know and worship God; that he is fallen, and in danger of perishing; that he has a soul to be saved, as well as a mind to be enlightened; the one being the very end and object of his present life, the other but subsidiary thereto; and therefore knowing (if indeed we do know) the value of our own souls, and the methods of salvation which God has appointed, we are urged, by far higher and more constraining motives than the mere desire of promoting their usefulness as members of human society,—although that motive has its weight, and is quite compatible with higher views,—to take measures for bringing to God, through Christ, those who are perishing, for lack of knowledge, the knowledge of his Gospel; and whose most urgent need is, of one who shall be to them at once a teacher and a Saviour."

"Convinced as we are, that the Bible, rightly interpreted, is the mighty engine by which alone the power of the prince of this world can be beaten down, and sinners rescued from his dominion, and truth established, and holiness promoted in the world; can it be a matter of wonder, if we, who are the Lord's watchmen, appointed to wield that sword of the Spirit, and to deliver the message of reconciliation, and to bring men to an almighty Saviour, are loud and earnest in protesting against all attempts to introduce a system of education, which advances to the highest rank, in value and importance, all the arts, and sciences, and inventions, which minister to the comforts or pleasures of this present life, but have no bearing upon the interests of eternity; while it thrusts religion, the science of salvation, the secret of godliness, into obscurity and neglect; and leaves to its casual lessons (for it makes them no essential feature of instruction) a few vacant hours, of which the teachers of different creeds may take advantage if they please. Is not this to dethrone the majesty of God's truth, from the pre-eminence assigned to it by Himself? Is not this to remove, as it were, the very fulcrum, upon which the great moral lever of education must rest, if it is to do its work completely and effectually, as the instrument of removing ignorance and vice, and of replacing them with that knowledge, the excellency of which is, that it giveth life to them that find it?"

Mr. Burgess's pamphlet is highly serviceable in the common cause, as proving, what some seem scarcely to believe, that the kind of national education which the Bishop of London so justly deprecates is, or was, strongly urged for the acceptance of parliament and the nation. We have in our hands several legislative folios of evidence, and also the publications of the Central Society of Education, from which we might select a volume of proofs; but for the present a few of Mr. Burgess's gatherings may suffice.

"In the summer of 1836 a meeting was held at the Thatched House, St. James's, for the purpose of forming an Educational Association, on which oc-

casion Mr. Wyse, the Roman Catholic member for Waterford, was called to the chair.....The president of this Society is the Right Hon. Lord Denman, Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench. The chairman of the Committee of Management, (which reckons seventeen members of Parliament,) is Mr. Thomas Wyse—Secretary, Mr. Duppa; besides these, amongst the members for life, are found the Right Hon. J. Abercromby, Right Hon. Lord John Russell, Lord Robert Grosvenor, and others, which, together with the members by the payment of annual subscription, make the number of members of Parliament amount to thirty-one.

"'Under various shapes,' says the Roman Catholic member for Waterford, exultingly, 'the great question is everywhere *sub judice*. A committee on English education has terminated its evidence; another on Irish, after sitting two sessions, is about to report in reference principally to the academical department; two others, appointed to consider the plan of the Board of Irish Education, are, at this moment, occupied in the House of Commons. Lord Brougham has brought in a bill for a minister and council of public instruction. An address to the crown' (by Mr. Wyse) 'for the same object, is to be moved in a few days in the Commons. Without of doors the Statistical Society of Manchester has been most meritoriously and successfully occupied; this Central Society of Education has been founded; and members of the British Association have agreed to assemble annually at the same places and times as that great body, for the purpose of considering the best means of advancing public instruction. We have seen the point from which we set out, we see that to which we are tending. Have we made slight progress?' The ends to which these efforts are tending, and which the clergy, with very few exceptions, have not yet publicly recognised, are well stated in the following summary of the objects and proceedings of the Central Society, by a contemporary writer. 'First, it has, in its authorised productions, argued for the exclusion of the Bible from the regular intellectual instruction of the school. Secondly, hinted that by the power of withholding an annual grant "from the restive," and affording pecuniary assistance "to the complying," all the mismanaged charity schools now existing (and under this vague term is included the schools of the National and Foreign School Societies) might be induced to place themselves under the Central Board. Thirdly, directly asserted that improvements "must be enforced by the state." Fourthly, maintained that government ought to have the power of preventing individuals from acting as schoolmasters whose capacities have not been duly certified. And, fifthly, avowed that it is just to use compulsion on the principles professed and acted upon by all shades of German government.'"

"The clergy of the Church of England, any more than that of Scotland, can have no sympathy with the false philosophy or liberalism of the day, which calls out for education without a creed, and for morality without its heavenly motives; they can never lend their sanction to a system of instruction in which Trinitarianism is to be considered as the peculiar doctrine of a sect, and therefore to be repressed; and according to which, a child, when reading in a class, may pass over the name of Christ whenever it occurs, should such name be offensive to the child or its parent."

"The evidence of Mr. Simpson, which occupied the committee of 1835 for seven days, is the most important for shewing the full extent of that system of popular education which society has to expect. .....The scheme advocated by this gentleman before a select committee of the House of Commons, may be condensed into the following substance. He proposes that there should be a board of education, similarly constituted and with similar powers to that proposed in his friend's Lord Brougham's bill; but he also recommends that in time the law should make it compulsory upon parents, as it is in Prussia, to send their children to the schools. For the more effectual promoting of this national object, Mr. Simpson would recommend all endowed property to be sold, to which he cannot see a single objection, seeing that Parliament would confer a vastly superior education to what the original founders ever heard of. He would, moreover, make no difference in the quality of elementary education, for any rank of society. Schools being established after this manner out of the funds of the nation, Mr. Simpson would next seek to put the schoolmaster quite upon a footing with the parish minister, and would provide for his increased emoluments by assessment, 'as for any other parish purpose: but those teachers, when so paid, should be secular teachers only, and not permitted, on pain of dismissal from their office, to teach religion directly or indirectly; and as this prohibition would be so strict, it would be of no consequence whether the teacher had any religion himself or none. A clergyman should not be suffered to be a teacher in the schools; but if he had

leisure he would do well to give his parishioners scientific instruction by lectures and experiments: at a proper time he might teach revealed religion, and bring an enlightened natural theology in aid of it. He would secularize secular education wholly and not partially. Mr. Simpson holds that education based upon religion, as it is called, is an utter absurdity. He is as positive upon the use of books, as upon the absurdity of basing education upon the doctrines of Christianity. He strongly deprecates the use of the Bible in secular schools, and would not permit even the use of its stories and parables (speaking entirely of secular education). He would not even place the Bible in the school without note and comment, nor even invite the children to read it. And finally, the witness tells the committee, that he considers the arrangements he had proposed as indispensable to carry into effect a system of national education. If these were the opinions of an individual called upon to state them to a select committee of the House of Commons, it might be of little consequence; but when we see Mr. Simpson's name enrolled in the list of the Central Society's members, the circumstance appears to throw a little light upon the real object of that Society. Moreover, Mr. Simpson tells the committee that he stands not alone in his principles and his views: besides Professor Pillans, he claims Dr. Reed, who contributes one of the papers to the Society's first publication, and he declares that that gentleman goes 'along with him in principle, and, as a consequence, in most of the details he had given in evidence.' The same is said of Professor Malden, of the London University, Mr. George Lees, Dr. Andrew Combe and his brother, of Edinburgh, Dr. Poole, Dr. Brigham, Messrs. Chambers, who are framing a series of educational books, and several others—actual educators: and, finally, he has 'the best grounds for anticipating' that his views will find a prominent place in the contemplated legislative enactments."

"Mr. A. J. D. Dorsey, examined before a select committee in June, 1835, finds no difficulty in reading the Scriptures with a Socinian and a Jew; for he has had the sons of both those denominations under his charge without any disagreeable result: he can inculcate the same principles of morality upon Socinians and upon Jews, as upon Trinitarians; and although he is aware that gratitude to Christ is a leading motive of duty, he does not care to bring a Jew within that motive; for it is not expected that an elementary school should embrace a course of theology! Whether this treatment of the Holy Scriptures, or the entire exclusion of them from the schools, would be less painful to a Christian mind, it may be difficult to say; but it is plain that either alternative must have the cordial opposition of every clergyman of the Church of England. The value that may be attached to a proviso for the introduction of the Bible into the contemplated schools will derive further illustration from the evidence of two Roman Catholics, the one a member of the Irish Board of Education, the other the president of the English College at Rome, and both members of the Central Society.

"The Right Honourable N. A. Blake, (examined on the 11th August, 1835,) in making selections from the Holy Scriptures for reading in the Irish schools, would not introduce anything that was calculated to offend any body of Christians: if a person were a professed deist, that is, rejecting revealed religion, speaking merely for himself, he should consider deism in that sense a disqualification; but not so an Unitarian, who believes in revealed religion: there is no reason why a person of that description should not be an inspector of the schools,—then surely he might teach the Bible in the schools, and that 'without offence.'

"But the Rev. Dr. Wiseman, better versed in the genuine principles of the Church of Rome, is less anxious than the lay-commissioner for either the Bible or its extracts, and would rather meet the Simpsonian principle of its entire exclusion. He states in evidence, on the 21st March, 1836, that the principle upon which the Bible is not made the essential portion of education is, that the Catholic principle of faith does not consider it necessary for each individual to have that personal knowledge of the Bible which the Protestant rule requires, and consequently there is no reason why the Bible should be put into the hands of children. Here the ground of difficulty respecting the introduction of the Scriptures at all, is removed, even as much as Dr. Bowring could wish, between the Roman Catholic Dr. Wiseman, and the Protestant Mr. Simpson."

"It is evident, from the statements and opinions of those witnesses, what is meant by the admittance of the Scriptures into elementary schools: the first best thing would be not to admit them at all; the next best, if they must be admitted, to take out of them everything peculiar to revelation. The doctrine of the Trinity, with the consequent doctrines of Atonement, and the influ-

ence of the Holy Spirit, the natural corruption of man, must be sacrificed to the Unitarian; the doctrine of justification by faith, the sole mediatorial office of Christ, the all-sufficient sacrifice of the cross, must be given up to appease the Roman Catholic; and the very name of Christ, but at all events the resurrection, must be folded up in silence to please the child of the Jew."

To the principle of expelling the Bible from the schools, such strenuous opposition has been made, that Lord Brougham, whether voluntarily or from policy, disappointed the fond hopes of the Central Society and their friends, by making it a provision in his bill that the Scriptures should be read as a regular part of school instruction. He also got rid of the objections of the Romanist and of the Jew, by permitting their children to be exempted from the Scripture-reading; but all the other objections—whether from the Dissenter upon principle, or the members of the Established Church—remain in full force. His bill is too large and too small; it gives much and nothing; it recognizes the Bible, and therefore offends those who think it contrary to civil and religious liberty to pay a rate for the support of religion; it *but* recognizes the Bible, without any provision for the inculcation of its doctrines and precepts; so that it offends all who think either catechisms or oral instruction desirable; in short, it is almost as paradoxical and enigmatical as its learned author.

The friends of the Church of England—and, we will add, every dissenter who loves his Bible better than political religionism—has reason to be grateful to Mr. Burgess for this well-timed exposition of astounding facts. We will now enliven the discussion with a few passages of fervid eloquence from Mr. Melvill. It is perhaps incident to an effective style of popular address, that its topics should be put forth with strong light and shade, and without all the guards and limitations which may be necessary to even-handed adjustment; and there are some matters thus circumstanced in Mr. Melvill's discourse; that is to say, there are propositions which are true only with certain modifications, and if those modifications are not expressed, the reader is apt to set down to the score of declamation what may be substantially grounded on solid reason. Thus, when Mr. Melvill says, "I prefer the untutored savage to the well-informed infidel; he is not half as dangerous, and he is twice as noble;" it should be remembered that the savage is an infidel too—at least a pagan, a worshipper of devils, and, perhaps, a shedder of human blood at the altar of his cruel idols; and a man infuriated by the most wicked and revengeful propensities; whereas the infidel was not an infidel because he was well-informed; nor the savage noble because he was a savage. If a nation could be thoroughly civilized without being christianized—which we doubt—we would not drive it back to cannibalism under the notion that it would be "more noble and not half so dangerous." We see innumerable mischiefs which education without religion would inflict upon a nation; but this does not of necessity land us in Mr. Melvill's extreme conclusion. Again we most cordially approve of the fundamental law of the National School Society, which makes religion—and that not in vague generality, but in close connexion with our apostolical church—the basis of education; but when we look at the actual experience of some of its schools, in which the master or mistress does not give to the outward form the vital spirit of truly Scriptural education, it is surely too much to say, without the slightest restriction or reserve, that the "education which it gives,

is thoroughly fitted, as we believe, for the training up children in the way they should go;" for what it proposes and aims at is not always *given;* and even the plan itself may not be, in all its points, "thoroughly" fitted to its object; on the contrary, we think that it might be considerably improved. But such *proing* and *coning* as this, we admit, greatly detracts from impassioned eloquence.

But the great elements of the subject before us are so broad, and their bearings so momentous, that they require, and will well sustain, even Mr. Melvill's fervour. It is no trifle that is at stake; the questions under agitation involve all that is most dear to us as men, as Britons, and as Christians. Is this world all, or is there an eternity? Are the souls of our children mortal or immortal? Is there any truth in the doctrine of man's fall in Adam, and his recovery by Christ; or is the Bible but a book of fables? Is our nature "very far gone from righteousness," so that it requires to be regenerated by a Divine power; or is it only so amiably bending that it is somewhat apt to go astray without a little wholesome philosophy? A true answer to those serious questions will decide the whole controversy respecting the right objects of education, whether for the poor or the rich, the young or the old.

But it is time that we should permit Mr. Melvill to favour our readers with his thoughts upon these important subjects:—

"Away with all the dream and delusion of the innocence of childhood. There are the seeds of every kind of evil in the smiling little one, whose picture might serve as the representation of a cherub. And those young hearts, which you are disposed to reckon untainted and unsophisticated, alas, they are the hearts of rebels against God, full of enmity towards holiness, and of love towards sin, though there may have been as yet but scanty opportunity for the manifestation of these inherent passions. What then have we to do if such be a just description of the very babes and nurslings of human kind?"

"We have a thorough belief, that the great secret of right training lies in the always regarding the child as immortal. The moment that this is kept out of sight, we scheme and arrange as though the child had to live only upon earth; and then our plans, not being commensurate with the destinies of their object, will necessarily be inadequate to the securing its good. Educate on the principle that you educate for eternity—otherwise it is impossible, that, with all your pains, you should produce a beneficial result. If you educate only for time; if you do not take care that every thing else shall be manifestly subordinate to preparation for an after-state of being; you virtually impress upon the young a lesson as to the importance of this world, irrespective of the next; and they will not be slow in inferring, however you may occasionally read them a lecture on religion, that you attach, in reality, a greater worth to earthly things than you seem willing in theory to allow. Whereas, if you contrive to make it evident, throughout the whole process of education, that you have but one aim, and that the aim of fitting for death and for judgment, the strong likelihood is, that the child will become so impressed with the importance of this aim, as to acquire a habit of taking it for its own.

"We know, of course, what will be immediately urged against such a theory of education as this. We shall be accused of rejecting all knowledge which is not strictly religious, and of laying an interdict upon various acquirements, and still more upon various accomplishments. But the accusation is unfounded, and shows forgetfulness or ignorance of a great truth, namely, that religion adds a fresh interest to every thing worth knowing, and a fresh grace to every thing worth doing. We should like to know, whether it would not be very possible to act on the above theory of education, and nevertheless to instruct the child in various branches of literature, and even to enrich him with much that is purely ornamental? Let us just show you what we mean in a few simple instances. When a child is first taught to read, why might not the teacher impress upon it, that the great worth of being able to read lies in the having access to the Bible? This would give a sacredness to the very alphabet, and each syllable that was mastered, might be felt as a step towards acquaintance with Deity. When a child is first taught

to write, why might he not be carefully informed, that he is beginning an art, without which Divine truth could hardly have been transmitted from age to age? why might he not be made almost to venerate the pen, which he is just learning to handle, as a wondrous instrument for tracing lines of light on the darkened page of man's history? When first instructed in figures, must he regard arithmetic merely as an ingenious contrivance for facilitating human business; why not be taught to view it as man's effort at compassing the eternity, the life-time of God? it would be a thousand fold more interesting in its failure than in its most striking successes. When the youth is engaged with the study of the dead languages, must he consider that classical literature is valuable only, or chiefly, because of the eloquence of ancient orators, or the melody of ancient poetry? These languages admit us into the Bible, and into works closely associated with the Bible: why then should not their student be made to feel, as he applies himself to Homer and Cicero, that he is but strengthening his acquaintance with Isaiah and St. Paul? And would our theory of education exclude the sciences over which philosophy presides? What are these sciences but the handmaids of Revelation; when are they so illustrious as when bending to Christianity, from which they have virtually derived all their life? We would have astronomy taught; but, as our student went from star to star, we would have him reminded, that, at every step of the wondrous journey, there was fresh cause for homage to the invisible Deity. Chemistry might be included; botany, mineralogy—for which of these does not subserve the showing God amazing in His workmanship; and which, therefore, might not be used as an engine for strengthening religious thoughts and feelings? We would have our scholar well read in history, that he might trace the course of Providence, and the fulfilment of prophecy. And is it to be said, that, with the principle on which we would proceed, there could be no place for what are termed accomplishments? Why so? painting is but an imitation of God's works, and might be used to humble us by its inferiority, when it most charms by its excellence. Music is but a vehicle for God's praises: and as to instructions which give a polish to the manners, we would have it taught that good manners are a part of good morals; that politeness is both a fruit and a duty of Christianity; and that, if it were a thing of no religious importance, how we demean ourselves in company, our blessed Saviour would never have delivered, as He did, a rule as to the place which we ought to take at table.

"It cannot be necessary for us to show you, how, when the child has reached the point at which he has to enter on a profession for life, we might still teach him to look at the future through the present. We might urge on him the importance of industry, not for the sake of the gains which it may secure, but because labour is the ordinance of God; and because, therefore, God may be as truly served in and through every lawful calling, as in and through observances which are more plainly religious. We might thus take off, if we may venture on the saying, the secular character from secular things, throw an air of sanctity round the most common occupations, and give to the workshop, the wharf, or the compting house, the aspect of a consecrated place, where God's presence was to be expected and His will performed. And who, after this hurried review of the workings of a theory of education, which should all along deal with a child as immortal, will venture to maintain that we must necessarily have a contracted discipline; and that we should not be able to communicate any stock of general information, or to prepare for the duties and intercourses of society?"

"There is a vast boasting on the part of the patrons of new schemes of education. They are the emancipators of the intellect. They are the friends of the people. They are the opponents of a bigoted priesthood. But let the poor man know that a fouler enemy never entered his village, nor crossed his threshold, than he, whatever his mental endowments, whatever his political eminence, who would withdraw his boys and girls from schools, where Christianity is the prime thing taught; and draft them into institutions where the religion of Jesus must be stripped of all peculiarities, and where, therefore, even the morality that is inculcated must be morality based on an insufficient foundation. Alas for our villagers, when they learn Christianity from Scriptural extracts, carefully concocted by Protestant, Papal, Socinian, and schismatical Commissioners—each striking out what might be a reproach to himself—and when they learn morals without motives; and motives comparatively they cannot have, since they must know nothing—for this would never go down with the variegated board—of Christ's dying as a sacrifice, or of the everlasting punishment of sin.

"But then, if we would prevent the

legislative enactment of any such system of National Education, we must see to it that we remove the grounds of the very frequent complaint, that there is a vast disproportion between the demand for instruction and its present supply. So long as numbers are left without any education, a handle is given to every wild theorist who may wish to make an experiment, and to every turbulent leader who may seek to undermine the institutions of the country. We are to prevent a pernicious, by providing a wholesome, education; and upon those who profess to be zealous for Christianity, must come all the blame, if evident deficiency in the means of right training afford excuse for introducing a machinery, whose mainspring is not the Gospel of Jesus."

We have written and quoted enough for the present; but the question is too important to be lost sight of. There were symptoms, some time since, of her Majesty's ministers being inclined to urge forward the subject; and though they have hitherto abstained, doubtless deterred by its difficulties, it is probable that they may take it up at some future session, either by a bill of their own, or by aiding the plans of others. It was about the year 1790 that the late prince of Benevento, then citizen Talleyrand, ex-bishop of Autun, and an avowed infidel, drew up his celebrated plan of national education, from which religious instruction was excluded. From that period to the present the children of France have been educated, for the most part, upon this godless principle; and bitter have been its fruits. The more thoughtful statesmen of that long-distracted country are beginning to acknowledge the evil and to seek for a remedy; and yet there are those in England, who, undeterred by the results of this awful experiment, are wishing to prosecute it in their own country. They are clamouring for the inculcation of what they consider alone worthy of the name of "useful knowledge," to the exclusion of religious knowledge; as if everything relating to the soul and eternity were useless; and that it is more important for a man to know how a steam-engine is made, than how he may get to heaven. We do not disparage steam-engine knowledge; very far from it; we would not restrict the rudest peasant in his pursuit of knowledge; we would provide a system of National Education, which, though subordinated to religion, should embrace large intelligence; but we should have hoped that the veriest utilitarian might have admitted that moral and spiritual wisdom, which he has daily occasion for, is quite as useful to him as scientific facts which he has no practical occasion for. But the Central Education Society confine utility to terrestrialism; they lament that even the day of holy rest should be devoted to Sacred objects; for they bitterly complain that our Sunday-schools are not converted into seminaries of secular education. "Here and there," say the conductors of the Central Society, "a Sunday-school may be found, in which children are allowed to learn to read and write; and in a few, but a very few cases, reading, writing, and arithmetic, are taught." There seems to be still a dearth of Sunday geography, chemistry, and so forth; but these, it may be presumed, will be added, when public feeling will tolerate it. But, as Hannah More observes in one of her letters, to teach children writing or arithmetic on the Lord's Day is to bind them to "a regular apprenticeship to sin." We are fain to quote the substance of the letter in which the remark occurs, for the sake of her prediction of the re-action which was to be dreaded from what she calls "the growing ultraism on the side of learning, falsely so called." Her droll description of the sciolism of rustic schools, in her day, does not at all abate our wish to improve them; but increases it, even in the

very articles which she seems to doubt about; but the point of her remarks is, that with all this parade of useful knowledge (even if it had been given, which it was not,) the knowledge of what was supremely useful was pretermitted. She says:—

"I had always a notion, that in a mass, suppose of a hundred children, there might possibly be ten who had superior capacities. Where there is talent, there is commonly energy; and I calculated that these ten, rising above their fellows, would, somehow or other, pick up a little writing and accounts, of which they might make good use in after life; and I have even paid for some sharp boy to go to another school on evenings to learn writing, while the other nine quietly drudged on, perhaps better without it.

"If you are not quite tired of me and my senilities, I will proceed to a few facts to illustrate my theory:—Not only in the great National schools, but in the little paltry cottage seminaries of threepence a week, I hear of the most ridiculous instances of the affectation of *literature*. A poor little girl of this stamp was in my room one day when a gentleman was sitting with me. He asked her what she was reading at school. 'Oh, Sir, the whole circle of the sciences!' 'Indeed!' said he, 'that must be a very large work!' 'No, Sir; it is a very little book, it cost half-a-crown.' My friend smiled, and lamented that what was of such easy attainment had cost him so much time and money. I asked a little girl, a servant's child, the other day, what she was reading, and if she could say her catechism. 'Oh, no, Madam, I am learning *Syntax*.' What I am going to add, you will think an exaggeration, if not an invention, but it is a literal fact. A girl in the next parish being asked what she learnt, answered, 'I learns gography, and the harts and senses.'

"In many schools, I am assured, writing and accounts are taught on Sundays. This is a regular apprenticeship to sin. He who is taught arithmetic when a boy, will, when a man, open his shop on a Sunday. Now, in my poor judgment, all this has a revolutionary, as well as an irreligious, tendency; and the misfortune is, that the growing ultraism on the side of learning, falsely so called, will irritate and inflame the old bigotry, which hugged absolute ignorance as hidden treasure, not to be parted with; while that sober measure of Christian Instruction which lies between the two extremes, will be rejected by both parties.

"*Tuesday.*—This frail and feverish being of mine did not allow me to finish my letter yesterday, so you must bear with one more absurdity. Many a child is brought to me in my room for a little reward of a tract, &c. Since I began this scrawl a sharp little girl was brought for this purpose. She repeated a short poem extremely well. I then said, 'Now I must examine what you know of the Bible. Who was Abraham?' After some hesitation, she answered, 'I think he was an Exeter man!'

"As experience is a sort of substitute for wisdom, I thought these petty details of things under my own eye, might be of some use. Happily, my own schools go on in the old-fashioned way."

We have often admired the complacency with which the apologists for schools and colleges upon the godless, graceless system of not allowing the Scriptures to be read, or prayer to be offered up, within the walls, claim to themselves the merit of following out the principles of Locke and Milton. Now "at length, for the first time in England," says Professor Hoppus, of London University College, has an academical institution been founded upon the true principles of "rational civil and religious liberty." We do not see why upon the true principles of "rational liberty"—to say nothing of Holy Scripture—those who wish to pray to God, and to read his holy word, have not as good a right to found academical institutions, according to the dictates of their consciences, as their "liberal" neighbours according to theirs. But be this as it may, we protest against the use of such names as those of Locke and Milton in favour of schemes which they would have held in abhorrence. Listen to Milton's own memorable words, in addressing his friend Hartlib in his Tractate upon Education: "But if you can accept of these few observations which have flowered oft, and are, as it were, the burnishings of many studious and contemplative years, altogether

spent in the search of RELIGIOUS and CIVIL knowledge, I here give you them to dispose of. *The end, then, of learning is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, to be like him.*" Is this the end of modern "useful knowledge" institutions? Milton's plan comprehended every age, "from twelve to one-and-twenty." He recommends first "to find out a spacious house, with ground about it"—say in Gower Street;—"this place," he adds, "should be at once both school and university." Of the juniors he says: "After evening repast, till bed time, their thoughts would be best taken up in the easy grounds of religion, and the storing of Scripture;" and of the more advanced,—"Sunday and every evening may now be understandingly spent in the highest matters of theology and Church history, ancient and modern; and ere this time the Hebrew tongue, at a set hour, might have been gained, that the Scriptures may be now read in their own original." This proposed "Institute," as he calls it, was very different, therefore, to the so-called "liberal" Institutes of modern days; and be it remembered that it was not meant to be a theological foundation, but a general college for "our noble and our gentle youth." Locke held similar opinions; not accounting that civil and religious liberty, much as he loved it, required the abolition of national churches, or the severance of popular education from "the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

THE BISHOP OF RIPON'S QUESTIONS FOR ORDINATION, &c.

The Lord Bishop of Ripon's Cobwebs to catch Calvinists; being a few remarks on his Lordship's Questions to Candidates, at his late ordination at Ripon. By a Clergyman of the Diocese. 1838.

The Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism vindicated from Misrepresentation. By Richard Laurence, D.D., Archbishop of Cashel, late Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. A new edition revised, with an Appendix. 1838.

Oxford Tracts Unmasked. By the Rev. Miles Jackson, of Leeds. 1838.

WE wrote in our volume for 1836, p. 256, as follows:—"The Rev. Dr. Longley, of Harrow, is to be the new bishop. This appointment has justly given general satisfaction, from his well-known character as well as ability. His unwearied attention to the academical institution under his presidency, and especially to the religious instruction and moral habits of the pupils, speak favourably for his discharge of the still higher duties on which he is entering." The anticipations which we thus cordially expressed have been abundantly fulfilled. His Lordship's unwearied attention to the duties of his high station, his kindness, conscientiousness, and truly Christian spirit, and his zeal and diligence in every good word and work, have justly won for him golden opinions both in his own diocese and in the general intercourse of Society; and not least among the friends of Bible, Missionary, Education, Temperance, Church-building, Pastoral Aid, and other religious and benevolent institutions. It is therefore with extreme pain that we have read in the pamphlet in our hands the series of questions issued by his

Lordship for the examination of candidates for Holy Orders. We will quote all that we find in the pamphlet:—

"FOR DEACONS.

I. Are all men by nature, as respects their inward condition, equally born in sin,—and as respects their relation to God, equally under condemnation?

II. What change in this relation and in this condition, is implied by the terms Justification and Sanctification?

III. What is the meritorious cause of Justification?

IV. Does Justification take place at Baptism, when that Sacrament is rightly administered and rightly received?

V. Does Sanctification take place in like manner?

VI. Is the change thus effected, that which is denoted by the term Regeneration?

VII. Does not our Church speak of all children who have been duly baptized, as regenerate? and is it consistent with the doctrine of the Church to apply to them afterwards the term unregenerate?

VIII. Would the language of our Services for Infant Baptism, warrant us in affirming that the effect of Baptism is so connected with the personal faith and the intention of the parents or sponsors, as that a defect on their part will necessarily invalidate the Sacrament, and render ineffectual the prayers of the Church offered in faith on the child's behalf? Can you draw from these services any argument in favour of the contrary supposition?

IX. Can a regenerate person fall from the state of salvation in which he has been placed at his Baptism?

X. In that case, on what terms may he hope to be restored to it?

XI. In *every* case, does he need a constant renewal and increase of the grace given in Baptism?

XII. What means has God appointed to be used after Baptism, whereby grace may be renewed and increased?

XIII. How does it follow from hence, that the Sacrament of Baptism ought to be received once only, and that of the Lord's Supper frequently by the same person?

XIV. Did Christ die for all mankind?

XV. Does God offer to all, salvation through Christ?

XVI. Does he give to all the power of accepting the offer? (In this and the preceding question the case of Heathen nations is not considered.)

XVII. Does our Church consider all persons who have been rightly baptized, as belonging to the elect people of God?

XVIII. Is it implied by the general tenor of the language of our Church, that elect persons, and that persons for whom Christ has died, may, through their own fault, finally perish?

XIX. Are the good works of a believer the cause or the consequence of his Christian privileges?

XX. In what sense are such works called good? And in what sense may they be said to be necessary to salvation?

FOR PRIESTS.

4. Show from expressions in the Catechism and in the Baptismal Service, that our Church holds that all Infants duly baptized are—1. Justified. 2. Sanctified. But that this change of state does not imply that they will necessarily be saved in the end.

5. Illustrate, from St. Paul's writings, the expression in our Catechism, "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." Quote other passages which show the importance which he attached to Baptism, and to the benefits thereby received. Certain expressions of this Apostle have been adduced in support of a contrary inference. What are these? and how would you answer the argument? Show from a passage in his history, that St. Paul himself was not justified until he had been baptized.

PASTORAL CONVERSATIONS.

D. Whether any thing more be needed for the right understanding of Scripture, than such assistance from the Holy Spirit as all who seek it rightly may hope to receive?

F. Whether God gives to any man such an assurance of his own salvation, as may free him from all fear of finally losing it through his own fault?

G. If God knows and orders what is best for all, where is the need of prayer?

LITURGY.

Distinguish between the Calvinistic and Arminian views of Predestination. Is the former affirmed by the language of our Articles? Examine this question by considering,

1. The conduct of the Calvinistic party. What alterations and additions did they wish to introduce into the Articles? Give a short account of the Lambeth Articles.

2. The known opinions of those who were principally concerned in drawing up our Articles. What were the opinions of Melancthon? What evidence is there of his having had any influence in the work?

3. The general tenor of the language of our Prayer-Book. Quote passages from it which oppose the doctrine of Final Perseverance. What words did the Calvinists propose to introduce into

one of our Articles in order to affirm that doctrine?"

The title of the pamphlet in our hands—"Cobwebs to catch Calvinists"—the writer says is taken from a remark made in the House of Lords respecting the petition against the Bishop of Peterborough's celebrated eighty-seven questions; which also acquired the name of "man-traps" and sundry other appellations; but in so serious a matter, everything either facetious or irritating ought to be avoided. It is impossible that we should not recoil from anything of a disrespectful character towards Bishop Longley, whether in reference to the individual or his office.

As for catching Calvinists, we have two remarks to make; first, that the Church of England did not intend Calvinists to be caught; and secondly, which is our main objection, that these questions must catch many learned and eminently pious men who are not Calvinists.

In reference to the first of these remarks we appeal to the seventeenth Article, the meshes of which seem rather constructed to entangle the fins of Arminians than of Calvinists. It is not at all necessary that we should be Calvinists ourselves, any more than Bishop Longley, in order to admit this; for Bishop Burnet himself, while arguing that an Arminian might conscientiously subscribe the Article, yet adds, "It is very probable those who penned it meant that the decree was absolute." He adds: "The Calvinists have less occasion for scruple, since the Article does seem more plainly to favour them." "It is not to be denied but that the Article seems to be framed according to St. Austin's doctrine." Bishop Horsley also remarks to the same effect: "Perhaps in point of true doctrine the language of our Articles agrees more nearly with the Calvinistic than with any other Protestant Confession, except the Lutheran." Hundreds of anti-Calvinistic Anglican divines have said the same.

And as the Article was not framed to catch Calvinists, so neither, in point of fact, were Calvinists caught by it; for Burnet adds, "In England the first reformers were generally in the Sublapsarian hypothesis." We do not believe that even the writer of the pamphlet before us would have been rejected from holy orders by our Reformers for his Calvinism, though he carries it to the extent of saying that Christ did not redeem all mankind; for not a few pious and learned divines of our communion, from the days of the Reformation to the present moment, have held this opinion, though we could never understand how they reconcile it with the language of Scripture or of their own Church.

But our object in noticing these questions is not to defend Calvinism or Calvinists, but to apply Bishop Horsley's well-known exhortation,—"Before you level your shafts at Calvinism, be sure you know what Calvinism is." If Calvinists only were caught, we might have left them to struggle in the toils, however much we might have lamented that hostilities should be renewed in the Church upon the doctrines of election and final perseverance. But these questions include much that is *not* Calvinism; for never can we admit that the Scriptural doctrine of justification by faith, as held by Protestants, is Calvinistic; or that it is Calvinistic to say that baptism is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace," but not invariably the channel of its communication, provided, as the Church of Rome says, the recipient, as in the case of infants, "presents no bar." It betrays great ignorance—for we do not

impute controversial trickery—to blend with Calvinism doctrines which have nothing to do with Calvin's opinions upon personal election and final perseverance. Archbishop Laurence, in his work entitled "The Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism vindicated from Misrepresentation," which has just been republished by his Grace with a preface, falls into this error—we will not use his Grace's own word, "misrepresentation." Thus he writes, "The *Calvinistical*, or, as they rather wish to be termed, the *Evangelical*, clergy;" "a party which appropriates to itself the epithet *Evangelical*;" and again, "If those whose opinions I propose to consider, prefer the denomination of the *Evangelical* to that of the *Calvinistical* clergy, it is not, I presume, because they disapprove the tenets of Calvin, but probably because they are better pleased with a general than an apparently sectarian denomination; indeed, for reasons best known to themselves, the open avowal of their creed upon the dogma of absolute predestination seems to be studiously avoided; but indications of it, too plain to be mistaken, are occasionally betrayed." Here, and throughout, his Grace is pleased to argue that the opinions upon baptism, of what he calls "the party" against whom he is writing, are of necessity accompanied by a belief in absolute election and final perseverance. We say nothing, lest we should say more than is meet, of his Grace's charity in supposing that the thousands of his Reverend (including some Right Reverend) brethren, with the hundreds of thousands of the lay members of our communion, whom he calls "a party," are acting in the hypocritical and wicked manner which he describes; that "for reasons best known to themselves," that is, for reasons which will not bear the light, they trifle with God, and sacrifice conscience, by a disingenuous and cowardly falsification of their opinions. Such charges from the pen of an archbishop are neither fatherly nor calculated to heal the wounds of the Church of England and Ireland. If any thing were necessary, in order to shew the injustice of the accusation, it would be the circumstances that his Grace's publication, which came out at the time of the baptismal controversy occasioned by Mr. (since Bishop) Mant's tract, was in reply to the Rev. John Scott, who with his reverend father the commentator did adopt the doctrines of absolute election and final perseverance; and certainly never shrunk from avowing them. They even appropriated the very word "Calvinism;" not attempting to mystify it under the epithet evangelical; though they believed that what was called Calvinism was scriptural truth, and therefore a part of evangelical doctrine. In a passage quoted from Mr. J. Scott's publication by Dr. Laurence himself, Mr. Scott says, "We are reproached as the self denominated evangelical party;" here then is no assumption of a title, but a complaint that, honourable as is that of evangelical, it was used in reproach to convey the notion of "party."

But the archbishop of Cashel may reply, that Mr. Scott professed to speak the sentiments of "many of his brethren," as well as his own respecting regeneration; and that therefore, as he believed in absolute election and final perseverance, so must they; for the archbishop seriously maintains that what he calls "the Calvinistic or Evangelical view of regeneration" inevitably involves the doctrine of "absolute election;" so that these cunning hypocrites "have spared no pains and exerted no little ingenuity" to pervert

the baptismal service, in order, "if possible, to leave untouched the key-stone of Calvinistical predestination." We make no doubt his Grace believes all this; just as the late Bishop of Bristol, Dr. Gray, a very amiable, devout, and respected prelate, in his Dialogues between a Christian and a Methodist, (which still deform the catalogue of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, notwithstanding the exposure of their gross mistakes and exceptionable doctrine,) believed that even the followers of Mr. Wesley are high Calvinists and predestinarians; strenuous defenders of absolute election and final perseverance!

There is a curious letter in the recently published Life of Mr. Wilberforce, from that excellent man to his honoured colleague in good deeds, Mr. Macaulay, which is worth quoting in connexion with the name of Mr. Scott and Archbishop Laurence's charge of what he calls "the evangelical party" being Calvinists in disguise; whereas it is well known that some of them are Calvinists, and others not; but we never heard that the former felt ashamed, any more than the latter, of avowing their opinions. Why should any Christian be ashamed of confessing what he believes to be Scriptural truth, and also the doctrine of his own church? Mr. Wilberforce, writing in 1811 to Mr. Macaulay, who then conducted the Christian Observer, says: "We are all greatly scandalised at seeing the advertisement of Scott's Final-Perseverance Sermon, staring people in the face, on the outside cover of the last Christian Observer, next adjacent to the advertisement of his reply to the Bishop of Lincoln. Surely it is very unfortunate—that is too strong a word; but it is to be regretted.... I am ashamed to name the very words Christian Observer." Here then is Mr. Wilberforce, one of the founders, correspondents, and friends of the Christian Observer, expressing his extreme regret to the Editor, lest even the casual juxta-position of a bookseller's advertisement should lead any ignorant person to fancy, or any captious one to pretend, that the views held by what Archbishop Laurence calls "a party," as opposed to those of Bishop Tomline, were of necessity connected with the doctrine of final perseverance, which Mr. Scott held, but many of his friends did not. No man had a higher respect and regard for Mr. Scott than Mr. Wilberforce: but he was jealous lest differences of opinion between many pious and learned men, upon the doctrines of election and final perseverance, should be identified on either side with those common doctrines which both equally account "evangelical." Does Archbishop Laurence really believe that this confidential letter to a friend, which is now casually brought to light twenty-seven years after, and not till the writer was in a world where there is no misconception, was a deliberate falsification of his real sentiments, and that he secretly held "the tenets of Calvin" upon "absolute predestination," though he hypocritically concealed them. Mr. Wilberforce's correspondent, we happen to know, was as strenuous as himself against that very doctrine, altogether differing from Mr. Scott, and considering his arguments inconclusive; but it would have been as unreasonable to have taken offence at his bookseller for admitting the advertisement of Mr. Scott's sermon, as to complain of his admitting the catalogue of the works of Hannah More, or any other of their anti-Calvinistic friends. Neither section of the alleged "party" placed the essence of Christianity in iden-

tity of opinion upon the doctrine of election and final perseverance. Mr. Scott, Mr. Legh Richmond, Mr. Simeon, and other (so called) Calvinistic friends, were co-operating most cordially, side by side, in the same pages with Wilberforce, and H. More, and Thornton, and Owen, and Macaulay, and Bowdler, and Babington, and other non-Calvinists, for "the common salvation."

The Archbishop of Cashel, in revising his work for a new edition, has prefixed a preface upon the Oxford Tracts for the Times, wherein he quotes those publications as making Calvinism the parent of Socinianism. "It was out of and through the reformed doctrine, that Socinianism took its rise; the chief corruptors of the Polish and Transylvanian churches, passed through Calvinism or Zuinglianism to their heresy;... let us beware of straining the letter of Holy Scripture, in conformity with pre-conceived notions, and the requisitions of human reason; wherein the school of Calvin most fatally set the example to that of Socinus." His Grace does not, he says, either defend or censure the Calvinists, in reference to this charge; but, if some of the statements which these tracts call Calvinistic are so, he confesses that he himself must be accounted so far a Calvinist. Here then he clearly discerns the unfairness of identifying some of the controverted questions respecting baptism with Calvinism; and the identification for which he himself contends is equally unjust. Whatever view the persons called "evangelical" may take of the construction of the Anglican baptismal service, it is not a question between the school of Calvin and any other; but one in which both Calvinists and Arminians may be divided among themselves. The instance to which we have before alluded, of the Wesleyan Methodists, is a striking proof of this. What body of Christians more fervently urges the doctrine of the new birth, or more solemnly protests against the notion that the baptismal register is sufficient proof that it has taken place; and yet the Methodists are among the most strenuous of anti-Calvinists. So, on the other hand, many divines have held *sub*, or *supra*, lapsarian views, and yet adhered to the opinion that regeneration is conferred only in baptism.

We have not taken up Archbishop Laurence's re-publication in order to review it; for we reviewed the whole question at the time of its first publication; but only in connexion with the notion that it is Calvinists only who are "caught" by such questions as those of Bishop Marsh or Bishop Longley. But, having his Grace's work in our hands, we cannot but most respectfully and earnestly thank him for his seasonable protest against some of the errors of the Oxford Tracts, though he agrees, he says, with the writers of them, "upon many points in opposition to the Calvinistical doctrine of regeneration." The following important passage deserves the most serious consideration of the Oxford divines:

> "Services which our Reformers found established, and of which they approved, they did not discard from the mere love of innovation; but re-established with as few alterations as possible. Nor do I apprehend, that they dived deeply into the writings of antiquity; but satisfied themselves with rubbing off from the surface some of that superstitious rust, which had been contracted by long usage during a period of illiterate centuries. I find no proof that they attempted to compose, after a recondite and laborious search, a new form; but solely endeavoured to amend an old one. Much less did they think of substituting traditional opinions and ceremonies for scriptural simplicity; but contented

themselves with enforcing the word and promise of Christ as the sure ground of Baptismal efficacy.

"It has indeed been said, (see Tracts for the Times, vol. II. p. vii. of Preface to View of Baptism) that 'our Church (blessed be God!) never took Luther, or Calvin, or any modern name for its teacher or its model, but primitive antiquity; and by the Holy Scripture alone, and the universal consent of primitive antiquity, as the depository of its doctrines, and the witness of its teaching, would she be judged.' But with Luther she did model her own formulary after that of the Church of Rome, which she found established, (some objectionable parts excepted,) when she compiled the very service under consideration; and I know not what proof exists of her having tested the doctrines and ceremonies contained in it by the primitive antiquity. That she was anxious to discard, and did discard, what she deemed superstitious in the formulary from which she copied, I am well convinced: but that she had previously consulted every writer of primitive antiquity upon the subject, and, in addition to her own deductions from Scripture, had satisfied herself upon the point of universal consent in all things which she adopted, I very much doubt. If she had so satisfied herself in her original compilation, she must have conducted her enquiries very carelessly; because some superstitious ceremonies, which she had incautiously adopted, she rejected at the very first revision. If the ceremonies alluded to (exorcism, with the use of the white garment, and holy oil) were not sanctioned by the universal consent of primitive antiquity, which had been carefully investigated, why were they originally adopted? and if they were so sanctioned, why were they subsequently rejected? But whether they were or were not so sanctioned, I cannot, with the zealous writer in the 'Tracts for the Times,' to whatsoever universal consent or traditional authority he may think them entitled, lament their rejection, and wish for their restoration.

"To the universal consent of primitive antiquity, when fairly and fully ascertained, I am willing to pay the highest respect; but upon points of doctrine, particularly such as regard the true sense of the sacred text, I cannot deem its judgment infallible, and its decisions incontrovertible. To Scripture alone, and not to primitive antiquity, much less to tradition, I am persuaded that the Church of England appeals, for the purity of her Liturgy and the truth of her doctrines; and that, a perfect stranger to the presumptuous dictates of modern Rationalism, she does not scruple to make unperverted reason her interpreter of the word of God."

To proceed seriatim through the Bishop of Ripon's questions would be a lengthened task; we will only touch upon a few particulars which occurred to us as we ran them over. We pity the young men who are expected to reply satisfactorily to them; for we are sure that older men, who have addicted themselves for many years to theological studies, could not do so. For ourselves we honestly confess that we could not shew from the Catechism or Baptismal Service what the Bishop requires every candidate for priests' orders to shew in question No. 4. The Catechism says that infants "cannot perform faith;" and all Christians admit that without faith there cannot be justification; we should therefore be puzzled to shew by the Catechism that we are justified in baptism, even if the doctrine were Scriptural. We should also find much difficulty in proving, as required, from the Catechism or Baptismal Service, that persons justified and sanctified will not be saved. We are not arguing the question, but only adverting to the documents to which Bishop Longley refers to corroborate his view of it. But we should be still more puzzled to shew from any passage in the history of the Apostle Paul, as further required upon pain of being refused priests' orders in the Ripon district of the Anglican church, that the apostle was not justified until he was baptized. We learn that he had faith in the Lord Jesus Christ before he was baptized, for he was baptized upon a profession of that faith; and he himself tells us that we are justified by faith, without saying one word of being justified by baptism; so that his history would have led us to the very opposite conclusion. The questions to deacons would equally perplex us; for we could not ho-

nestly bring out such answers as are implied in some of them;—we say implied in them, for they are for the most part what lawyers call "leading questions." Some of these leading questions, if we rightly comprehend their drift, tend to most unscriptural and anti-Anglican conclusions. Thus the emphatic typographical distinction given to the word "every" in question XI. might imply, what the Church of Rome and the Oxford Tract divines make the very foundation of their system; that in baptism is conferred, to use Mr. Newman's comparison, a sort of angelic nature; so that it is possible, as Bishop Jebb teaches, for a baptized person never to commit a sin—venial sins only excepted; as if any breach of God's law were venial; and that in point of fact there are those who grow up in this immaculate state, so that according to Mr. Newman "they literally do not know the power or misery of sin." How such persons can concur in the doctrinal statements, or use the penitential confessions, of the Church of England, we could never comprehend. If this question does not point to this hypothesis we are at a loss to know what is its object.

To some of the questions which require a categorical answer, we could neither say Yes nor No. Thus to No. XIX, "Are the good works of a believer the *cause* or the *consequence* of his Christian privileges?" the only answer we could give is, "Neither the one nor the other." If his Lordship means that "the good works of a believer" are the cause of his privileges, this indeed agrees with the statement of Mr. Newman, as quoted in our Number for April, p. 262, where he says that "works are the instrumental *cause* [Bishop Longley's very word] of faith," and consequently of the believer's privileges; a doctrine diametrically opposed to the declarations of St. Paul and of the Articles and Homilies of our own Church. But even if it be implied —which we sincerely believe to be the Bishop's meaning—that good works are the *consequence* of the believer's privileges; even this would not very clearly admit of an intelligent affirmation; for it is one of the believer's privileges that he is "created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" and how can a privilege be its own consequence? Perhaps, however, we altogether misunderstand the purport of the question; but if so, we can the less admit that it is a question fit to be propounded to a young man fresh from college, and who cannot possibly have made himself master of all the bearings of these abstruse inquiries.

And this leads us to mention a strong objection to these questions; that they are abstruse, knotty, and not calculated for practical utility, as queries addressed to candidates for holy orders. Take, for instance, the eighth diaconal question. We say, most unaffectedly, that we find great difficulty in ascertaining what is its object. It implies that there are some persons in the Church of England who imagine that "the effect of baptism is so connected with the faith and the intention of the parents or sponsors, as that a defect on their part will necessarily invalidate the sacrament." Against what class of opinions is this singular question directed? What practical error is it meant to oppose? As to the "Calvinists," they hold no such opinion, as that, because parents or sponsors do not believe, the child, when he "comes to age" and believes, loses the benefit of baptism because somebody else did not believe. The question, if it affects any of the clergy of the

diocese of Ripon, affects those of Dr. Hook's school, who most assuredly were not meant to be scathed by it. It affects them, we say, because they do believe in justification by vicarious faith; for they teach, with the Council of Trent, that "infantes obicem non ponentes," are justified in baptism, though unable to exercise faith themselves, by the faith of the church imputed to them for righteousness; and hence Dr. Pusey has the pithy running title of "Infants Believers." Now upon this hypothesis there is certainly a difficulty which requires to be solved; for if all that is represented as taking place in baptism really does so, it is a momentous question, whether faith, being necessary to justification, and the infant having no faith, but only, as the council of Trent says, "opposing no obstacle," the vicarious faith of the church, or of parents, or sponsors, if it be defective, will be imputed for righteousness; but no such difficulties are found upon the simple hypothesis, that baptism is not of two kinds; but that the case of an infant resembles that of an adult; only that the ordinance is antedated in faith, hope, and charity, upon the expression of the wish of the parents or sponsors to dedicate the child to God in holy baptism, in anticipation of faith being exercised when the child "comes to age."

This question of Dr. Longley's actually sets aside the doctrine of justification by faith; for it says that we are justified in baptism; and yet that the effect of baptism is not impeded by the absence of faith in the parents or sponsors who make the stipulations; there may, therefore, be justification without faith. But this defect, it is intimated, is supplied by "the prayers of the church offered in faith." But the prayers of the church may not be offered in faith; they may be gone through ignorantly or carelessly as a mere ceremony, without any "personal faith and intention." By whose faith then is the child justified when none is exercised?

There is an ambiguity in the expression, "the prayers of the church," which a candidate ought not to be puzzled with. Does it mean the prayers of the persons assembled on the occasion, none of whom, it may be, pray in faith? Or does it mean the prayer of the church Catholic, offered generally and vicariously without any reference to this particular child? The more the question is examined, the more will it present of incongruity. Strict definition of terms is fatal to it. While alluding to this eighth question, we would ask, what is implied by the words "contrary supposition?" There had been no "supposition" at all; there had been only a categorical question, which, if a young man could not answer intelligently, on account of his not perfectly comprehending it, he would at least be able to answer conveniently, by judging, from the words "contrary supposition," what was the wish of the propounder; and indeed most of these questions are thus constructed; so that a candidate cannot reply to them in a manner contrary to the obvious intention of the inquirer, however modestly he may do so, without seeming to answer pertly and offensively. We are sure that the ingenuous and manly mind of Bishop Longley must, upon consideration, perceive the force of this remark. A bishop, in examining a body of young men for holy orders, is conducting what the lawyers call an examination in chief, and not a cross-examination; at least, not unless he thinks that a candidate is evading his fatherly inquiries. An ex-

amination in chief is intended to bring out the fair honest deposition of the party; a cross-examination to entangle him, and to make him exceedingly uncomfortable if he does not say what the cross-examiner wishes, whatever may be his real belief. Now if a bishop thinks he ought to inquire minutely into a young man's opinions upon all the intricate topics embraced in Dr. Longley's questions, he ought at least to do so in a manner that will not subject the examinant to the charge of rudeness in modestly answering his interrogations. But several of these questions are so constructed, that if a candidate holds a different opinion to the examiner, his answer must necessarily appear disrespectful. The honest answer, for instance, to No. 4, to Priests, in the case of many thousands of clergymen, would be, "I cannot shew any such thing." But this would appear insulting: and yet it is only a straight-forward reply to the question. The interrogations are generally *tentative*; and such interrogations ought to be specially avoided; since they distress an ingenuous mind, that feels some doubt or difficulty; while the unscrupulous, seeing their drift, will answer them so as to please the proposer.

We have said that such questions are not for practical utility; they are, for the most part, dry and speculative: and whether the candidate answer yes or no, he may in either case be wholly unfit for the sacred office. A well-read divine, whatever might be his theological opinions, would feel more difficulty in answering many of them, than a rash sciolist. What benefit can arise from a minute inquisition into a young man's unformed opinions about abstruse points respecting election, predestination, and final perseverance, which have divided the ripest theologians, and will never perhaps be settled on this side of eternity. But we have a stronger objection to these questions than that they are ill-framed; which is, that they are unjust; since they are so constructed that the candidate must be of a particular school in order to answer them in a satisfactory manner. It is not enough that he professes to receive literally and grammatically every article of the Anglican code; but he must avow his belief in baptismal justification; he must guarantee that he will never tell a wicked man that he needs to be born again; and, above all, he must abjure the doctrines of election and final perseverance. Now we boldly assert, that it is unjust for any English Bishop officially to require such *credenda* or *abjurenda*, whatever may be his own private opinions. Even as regards Calvinism, he would go beyond the intention of his church, if he excluded from holy orders any pious and well-qualified candidate, because he believed in the doctrines of election and final perseverance, or admired the Lambeth Articles themselves. Why is no divine of the sentiments of Whitgift, or Usher, or Hall, or Hooker, or Leighton, to be admitted into the new diocese of Ripon? The Archbishop of York never refused candidates upon such grounds. We could mention the names of many of the best clergymen in Yorkshire, living and dead, who would inevitably have been rejected by this ordeal.

But we repeat, that it is not in defence of Calvinism that we are writing, though it is a collateral part of our argument that there is nothing in the formularies of the Church of England which excludes a doctrinal Calvinist from its communion. Nay more, we are not at present offering any opinion upon the construction of the An-

glican baptismal service, so much alluded to in these questions; though sure we are that our church never intended a candidate to be rejected, either because he adopted the distinction of baptismal and spiritual regeneration, as set forth in Bishop Bradford's tract on the Christian Knowledge Society's list, and lately defended with great ability by our recently departed friend and occasional correspondent, the pious and truly venerable Mr. Biddulph; or because, with Archbishop Laurence's antagonist Mr. Scott, and many other divines eminent for piety, talents, learning, and attachment to the Church of England, he considered that regeneration has but one sense; and that it is predicated by our church in baptism, not absolutely, but in a judgment of faith, hope, and charity, according to the declaration of the Catechism in answer to the inquiry, "Why are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform faith and repentance?" —"Because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." We will not open, in the present discussion, any question which is fairly debateable among scriptural Protestants; for we cannot concede that the doctrine of justification, which gives shape and colour to the Bishop of Ripon's interrogations, is one of these open questions; much less that it ought to be decided, as his Lordship decides it, upon the Romanist hypothesis of sacramental justification, instead of justification by a true and living faith, according to the doctrine of the Church of England. Bishop Burnet himself —than whom no man could be a stronger anti-Calvinist—truly asserted, that "The doctrine of sacramental justification is justly to be reckoned among the most mischievous errors that are in the Church of Rome." Yet this "most mischievous" Popish error the Bishop of Ripon is making a test for admission to Holy Orders in his diocese. There is surely some mistake or inadvertence in this matter, which we are at a loss to account for. We do not believe that when a man so truth-loving as Bishop Longley, seriously applies his powerful mind to the consideration of this vital question, he will continue to espouse this "most mischievous error," much less make it the basis of his examination of candidates for the ministry of the church. Can he give us a single passage of Scripture which favours it? Assuredly he cannot: and Bishop Burnet was right in adding to the words above quoted, "Since, therefore, the doctrine is no where mentioned in all these large discourses that are in the New Testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it." Burnet states also, as an argument against it (though its being unscriptural is quite sufficient), that "Since the natural consequence of this doctrine is to make men rest contented in low imperfect acts, when they can be so easily made up by a sacrament, we have just reason to detest it, as one of the depths of Satan; the tendency of it being to make those ordinances of the Gospel, which were given us as means to raise and heighten our faith and repentance, become engines to encourage sloth and repentance." It is, in truth, a grievously demoralizing doctrine, as we see proved by the conduct of the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland. There is nothing that tends to unhallowed licence, but quite the contrary, in the scriptural doctrine of justification by faith; because the very faith that justifies is declared also to purify: so that if there be not the fruits of

holiness, it is denied that there could have been any justifying faith. But not so where it is maintained that justification is conferred in baptism, though there was no fruit-producing faith: and that, to use the words of Mr. Dodsworth, "Those who are living in every kind of worldly folly and frivolity," "who are addicted to intemperance and lust, or may be denying the fundamental truths of the Bible," are to be addressed as "saints," though, he says, they ridicule the name—are to be told that they are "*faithful brethren in Christ*," and that they are "sitting in heavenly places in him," while immersed in their vices. This is the doctrine of baptismal justification, as recently explained by one of its advocates.

We respectfully request the Bishop of Ripon, if he should honour our remarks with his perusal, to observe how decidedly Bishop Burnet takes for granted that the Doctrine of Sacramental Justification is a Romanist figment, not supposing that any man would attempt to father it upon the Church of England. We know how cautious the writers of the Oxford Tracts have been to avoid offensive words, such as "merit," and also to assert true propositions, such as that "we are justified by faith without works" (meaning in baptism); in order to repel many of the arguments brought against those who maintain the merit of good works, and that they aid our justification. But these plausible distinctions, which have led so many Protestants to believe that the doctrines in question could not be essentially Romanist, were urged quite as strongly by the Church of Rome itself. We will quote from a learned divine, not of our own communion, (Dr. Owen) two short passages, which will shew that even the most learned and able opponents of the Church of England did not venture to insinuate that she held the doctrine under consideration, which Dr. Owen, like Bishop Burnet, spoke of as rank Popery, unknown to any Protestant communion. The Church of Rome offers a much better system than that of those Anglican divines, who say that the doctrine of justification by faith is, after all, but a question of barren speculation, since practically speaking we were all justified in our infancy in baptism; for the Church of Rome, having attached justification to baptism, found it necessary to resort to the unscriptural hypothesis of a second justification—the first being by faith, the second by good works; and to the same hypothesis Bishop Longley must resort, if he would avoid those demoralizing consequences which Burnet says necessarily result from the doctrine of sacramental justification. The following are the passages from Dr. Owen:—

"The Romish Church do ground their whole doctrine of justification upon a distinction of a double justification, which they call the first and second. The first justification is the infusion, or the communicating unto us, an inherent principle or habit of grace or charity. Hereby they say original sin is extinguished, and all habits of sin are expelled. This justification, they say, is by faith—the obedience and satisfaction of Christ being the only meritorious cause thereof. Only they dispute many things about preparations for it, and dispositions to it. . . . . However, the Council of Trent warily avoided the name of merit, with respect to this their first justification. . . . The second justification is an effect or consequent hereof; and the proper formal cause thereof is good works, proceeding from this principle of grace and love. . . This distinction was carried unto no other end but to bring confusion into the whole doctrine of the Gospel. Justification through the free grace of God, by faith in the blood of Christ is evacuated by it; sanctification is turned into a justification, and corrupted by making the fruits of it meritorious."—*Owen on Justification, Chap. V.*

"The principal differences about the

doctrine of justification, are reduceable unto three heads. First the nature of it, namely, whether it consist in an internal change of the person justified by the infusion of a habit of inherent grace or righteousness; or whether it be a forensic act in the judging, esteeming, declaring, and pronouncing a person to be righteous, thereon absolving him from all his sins, giving unto him right and title unto life. *Herein we have to do only with the Church of Rome*, all others . . . . being agreed on the forensic sense of the term, and the nature of the thing signified thereby." "If free justification through the blood of Christ and the imputation of his righteousness be not able to preserve its station in the minds of men, the Popish doctrine of justification, must and will return upon the world with all the concomitants and consequences of it." "If this truth concerning evangelical justification, be once disbelieved among us, or obliterated by any artifice out of the minds of men, unto these things (namely, the Papists' doctrine of justification, with the addition of those other ingredients of confession, absolution, penances, or commutations, &c.) at one time or other they must and will betake themselves; for the new schemes and projections of justification, which some at present would supply us withal, are no ways suited, nor able to give relief or satisfaction unto a conscience really troubled for sin, and seriously enquiring how it may have rest and peace with God. I shall take the boldness therefore to say, whoever be offended at it, that if we lose the ancient doctrine of justification by faith in the blood of Christ, and the imputation of his righteousness unto us, public profession of religion will quickly issue in Popery or Atheism, or at least in what is the next door unto it."—*Ibid. Chap. IX.*

If any man will seriously examine the whole course of the controversy between the Protestant churches and the church of Rome, upon the infinitely important subject of a sinner's justification before God, we think he cannot but admit the soundness of these conclusions. We have lately had to oppose divines of the school of Mr. Knox and the Oxford Tracts, in regard to the opinion adopted by them from the church of Rome, that we are justified by righteousness wrought within us; in other words, by our good works; and we have equally to oppose the notion also held by them, that we are justified in baptism by a faith which, as Bishop Marsh asserted, is not necessarily productive of good works; that is, by a dead faith. How two such notions can exist together may puzzle a plain man; and the only solution is, that though these writers are for the most part afraid of the Popish sound of a first and second justification, they in truth adopt it as the ground-work of their system. Hooker ably refutes both these Popish notions (not foreseeing that they would ever come to be urged as Anglican doctrines) though we need no other confutation, so far as our church is concerned, than our own articles; for we would respectfully ask the Bishop of Ripon how it is that in the articles which treat of our justification, no mention is made of baptism but only of faith, if baptism is really the instrument or vehicle; and how, moreover, when the faith which the article speaks of as justifying, is declared necessarily to produce good fruits, it can be maintained that our church teaches we are justified by a proxy faith ("obicem non obstantes") in baptism, which, it is admitted, may never produce any such fruits,—a fact verified in every school and nursery. Either of the questions—What is justification? and Is justifying faith a dead faith or a living one? if answered as Scripture answers it, and as the Church of England in accordance with Scripture answers it—would settle the point. We will trespass with a few sentences from Hooker's Sermon on Justification, which touch upon both these questions; only premising that he is speaking of Popery, though some would substitute these Popish doctrines for Protestantism. He says that the Papists teach as follows:—

"The infusion of grace hath her sundry after-meals; for the which cause they make many ways to apply the infusion of grace. It is applied to infants through baptism, without either faith or works, and in them really it taketh away original sin, and the punishment due unto it. It is applied to infidels and wicked men in the first justification, through baptism, without works, yet not without faith; and it taketh away both sins actual and original together, withal whatsoever punishment, eternal or temporal, thereby deserved. Unto such as have attained the first justification, that is to say, the first receipt of grace, it is applied farther by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second justification. If they work more and more, grace doth more increase, and they are more and more justified. To such as diminish it by venial sins, it is applied by holy-water, Ave-Marias, crossings, Papal salutations, and such like, which serve for reparation of grace decayed. To such as have lost it through mortal sin, it is applied by the sacrament, as they term it, of penance.... This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth teach her followers to tread, when they ask her the way to justification." "Whether they speak of a first or second justification, they make it the essence of a divine quality inherent; they make it *righteousness which is in us.* If it be in us, then it is ours, as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him, for if He withdraw the breath of his nostrils we must fall to dust. But the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own; therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in him. In him God findeth us, if we be faithful (believing), for by faith we are incorporated into Christ. Then, although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which is impious in himself, full of iniquity, full of sin; him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin remitted through repentance, him God beholdeth with a gracious eye; putteth away his sin, by not imputing it; taketh away the punishment due thereunto, by pardoning it; and accepteth him in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law—shall I say more perfectly righteous than if he himself had fulfilled the whole law? I must take heed what I say; but the Apostle saith; 'God made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' Such we are in the sight of God our Father as is the very Son of God himself. Let it be counted our folly, or phrenzy, or fury; whatsoever it is, it is our comfort and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the Son of man, and that men are made the righteousness of God."

Hooker says that the Papists agree with us in the following particulars: "They teach, as we do, that infants, that never did actually offend, have their natures defiled, destitute of justice (righteousness), averted from God." They further teach, that "none do efficiently work with God but God." Again, "they teach that unto justice (righteousness) no man ever attained but by the merit of Jesus Christ." Further, "they teach, as we do, that although Christ as God be the efficient, and as man the meritorious, cause of our justice, yet in us also there is something required;"—that is the work of the Holy Spirit sanctifying us. "Thus far," he adds, "we join hands with the Church of Rome;" and then he puts the question, "Wherein then do we disagree?" He answers:—

"We disagree about the nature and essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease; about the manner of applying it; about the number and power of means which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort. When they (the Papists) are required to shew what the righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a Divine spiritual quality; which quality received into the soul doth first make it to be one of them who are born of God; and secondly, endue it with power to bring forth such works as they do that are born of him: even as the soul of man, being joined to his body, doth first make him to be of the number of reasonable creatures; and, secondly, enable him to perform the natural functions which are proper to his kind; that it maketh the soul amiable and gracious in the sight of God, in regard whereof it is termed grace; that it purgeth, purifieth, and washeth out all the stains and pollutions of sins; that by it, *through the merits of Christ,*

we are delivered, as from sin, so from eternal death and condemnation, the reward of sin. This grace they will have to be applied by infusion, to the end that, as the body is warm by the heat which is in the body, so the soul might be righteous by inherent grace; which grace they make capable of increase, as the body may be more and more warm," &c.

Against this system, however modified, we shall ever feel it our duty to contend, as Hooker did. Its nucleus is *sacramental justification, instead of justification by a living and fruit-producing faith.* Grant Rome this, and she needs ask no more, in order to accrete around it her first and second justification; her blending of sanctification with justification; her doctrine of mortal and venial sin; and her system of penance, to eke out, or to restore, or to enhance, justification. We are very far indeed from saying that the Bishop of Ripon's questions make any approach to this; we only mean, that though the acorn is not an oak, it contains the germ of one.

If in the foregoing pages any one word or sentiment has escaped our pen, which is not consistent with the highest respect and esteem for the Right Reverend prelate whose code of questions has elicited our reluctant remarks, it has been through inadvertence, and not design. In remarking, for instance, that his lordship's questions are unjust, we meant to specify only the result, not the animus of the proposer; for we never supposed for a moment that Dr. Longley would be guilty of wilful injustice. We believe that he has acted conscientiously, and to the best of his judgment. At the same time, considering what numbers of pious and exemplary clergymen these questions, if enforced as a test of doctrine, must exclude from the new diocese of Ripon, we cannot but deeply lament that they should be propounded, and made the basis of examination for holy orders. Why also divide the clergy by setting up tests of doctrine, not recognized in the Articles of the Church of England; to say nothing of doctrines actually opposed to them, as is that of baptismal justification? The circumstance is the more to be regretted at this moment, when much discussion is going on in the diocese of Ripon upon these very questions, in consequence of certain doctrines and practices imported into Leeds, grounded for the most part upon Romanist and not Protestant opinions, relative to the nature and effects of the sacraments. A pamphlet has just fallen into our hands, written by the Rev. Miles Jackson, of Leeds, which informs us that a controversy has been going on in a Leeds newspaper, between himself and one who subscribes himself "A Writer in the Tracts for the Times." We are not concerned to eulogize every word or remark in Mr. Jackson's pamphlet; but Dr. Hook and his friends would find it impossible to answer its chief arguments, either from the word of God, which Mr. Jackson says they do not much quote in these matters, or from the formularies of their own church. He complains, that when he quoted St. John about being born again, his opponent, instead of attempting to shew that he misunderstood the inspired writer, put him off with an appeal to "the Fathers." This is paying theological debts in Oxford Tract tokens, instead of the golden coin which bears the image and superscription of heaven. Mr. Jackson justly traces up the Leeds errors to their source, "the Popish notion that all are justified in baptism." He asked how this could be, since infants have not faith; and he coveted a few lines from the Prayer-book on the subject; but instead of this he was only treated with a remark of St.

Augustine's, that "since infants are not capable of faith, the sacrament of baptism is to them instead of faith;" which, he not unfairly replies, is making baptism the qualification for baptism. He also animadverts upon Dr. Hook's notion of a "remedial principle of life implanted in baptism," by which a man has the power of afterwards converting himself. Dr. Hook is further quoted as saying that "in regeneration God supplies the *sap* to every part of his vine; that gradual conversion is the growth, and sanctification and renovation the fruit;" whereas he says shortly afterwards that "in the case of a heathen, conversion precedes regeneration;" so that the branch grows and bears fruit before God supplies it with sap.

We might transcribe much more; but we have quoted enough to shew the nature of the discussions which are going on in the diocese of Ripon; and we grieve that his Lordship's questions should be held up in triumph as giving his fatherly countenance to what we cannot but believe to be the wrong side of the controversy.

But our objections, we reiterate, go beyond the side which the questions take, to their general character. Had a corresponding set of intricate, puzzling, pro-Calvinistic questions been propounded, our objections would have been the same. We object altogether to the system of launching young clergymen as bristling polemics. This view, we well remember, was justly taken at the time of Bishop Marsh's eighty-seven questions, by some who accorded with him in his doctrines, as well as by ourselves, who differed from him. The conductors of the "Christian Remembrancer," for example, in their Number for January, 1821, remarked:

"We judge those questions to be inexpedient. As a test of Calvinism, they have their force; an honest Calvinist cannot answer them to the satisfaction of the bishop.....We contend that the articles are not Calvinistic; but we cannot think that the maintenance of an opposite opinion is the only fault which requires to be discountenanced.....If these questions are intended to embrace the whole examination, they are objectionable, not from their extent, but from their deficiency. Anti-Calvinism is not the whole body of divinity, with which the theologian should be acquainted, nor is it by any means the first point to which his attention should be directed.....We fear that these questions have a tendency to counteract the range of a young man's professional studies, to give him a wrong bias at his very outset, and to make him a polemic in his pupilage.....They invite him to a superficial investigation and precipitate apprehension of things hard to be understood, and which the candidate for (holy) orders is seldom prepared to discuss.

"There is another objection which ought not to be entirely overlooked. The bishop of Peterborough's example may be followed in other quarters, and a Calvinistic exposition of the Article in the shape of question and answer may perplex and mislead those by whom his Lordship's queries will not be seen .....The ardour of the controversialist requires to be moderated, not inflamed; and it is to be regretted that any deviation from the ordinary course of episcopal proceedings should not be calculated to produce that effect."

We will not add a word to these remarks of our anti-Calvinistic cotemporary.

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.

The Life of William Wilberforce. By his Sons, Robert Isaac Wilberforce, M.A., Vicar of East Farleigh, late Fellow of Oriel College; and Samuel Wilberforce, M.A., Rector of Brighstone. In five volumes: London, 1838.

We cannot permit a single month to pass over the publication of these already popular and highly-apprcciated volumes, with-

out placing their title-page upon our list of reviews, though we have not space left to enter into their delightful and valuable contents, and must defer our general remarks upon them to a future occasion. Among the great men of his age, as even the denizens of this world estimate greatness, Mr. Wilberforce stood very high; among the good men he stood yet higher; but in the union of the two, he was raised far above his cotemporaries, and has left a memorial second to none in the combination of qualities which adorn, and dignify, and gladden humanity. His record is inscribed in the annals of nations; but—far brighter lot—it is "on high." His name is engraven on the tablets of history; more peculiarly in connexion with that great question of justice, religion, and humanity, with which it is most popularly identified; but his influence has been felt in a still loftier region than that even of philanthropy, except indeed as the highest philanthropy embraces far more exalted interests than those of secular man, seeking the rescue of the soul as well as the body, and not content with anything less than that the captive thrall should become "Christ's freeman." Mr. Wilberforce atchieved many excellent things as a statesman; and he encircled himself with a bright halo of love, esteem, and gratitude, as the liberator of Africa; but that which most impresses our minds, upon looking back at his life and times, is the extraordinary degree in which he was the instrument in the hands of God, of promoting that blessed revival and extension of religion in this and other lands, the effects of which will doubtless be felt to remote posterity.

These volumes are of inestimable value, as shewing whence it was that the oil was supplied in secret which burned with so bright a lustre before mankind. The statesman who admired Mr. Wilberforce's captivating manners and affecting eloquence, may here turn aside to witness his private humiliations before God: the hallowed communings of his spirit with its Maker; and discern in his secret fastings and prayers, his self-abasement, and earnest appeals for Divine guidance and support, the genuineness and strength of those principles which he was not ashamed to avow before the sarcastic scoffer, or polished sceptic, and by which his light so shone before men, that blind or hardened must they have been, if they did not glorify his Father which was in heaven.

His sons have been at no loss for materials; but rather have been oppressed by their abundance. They have his own private Diary and Journals from 1783 to 1833; recollections of his conversations; memoranda dictated by him late in life; and a large collection of letters written by him to his friends. The filial biographers intended to express their obligations to the contributors who have favoured them with these letters, but found the list of "an inconvenient bulk." The largest contributor of these invaluable relics was Mr. Wilberforce's much valued friend Mr. Zachary Macaulay, with whom, from a very early period, he had fought side by side the great battle of the slave trade, and united in innumerable works of piety and philanthropy. Mr. Macaulay did not live to read the memoir of his beloved friend, having been taken to his rest on the 13th of May. To those who knew Mr. Macaulay it will be highly gratifying to read Mr. Wilberforce's constant testimonies of affection, respect, and admiration for that great and good man; and his grief and

abhorrence at the calumnies which were raised against him in consequence of his faithful and unwearied efforts for the suppression of the slave-trade and slavery. We refrain at present from attempting any account of Mr. Macaulay's life or character, as we could not do justice to him or to our own feelings in a few passing remarks; and we doubt not a far more ample detail will be expected in the pages of a work, of which, in conjunction with Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Venn, Mr. H. Thornton, Granville Sharp, Dr. Jowett, Hannah More, and other friends, he was one of the founders, and which he edited from its commencement, (except we believe that the Rev. Josiah Pratt kindly and ably superintended a few of the first numbers till the work was brought into train) up to the close of the year 1816: when his many other pressing engagements, and particularly his anti-slavery and anti-slave-trade labours, induced him to consign it to the present editor. For many years he has had no connexion whatever with our work, direct or indirect, as a writer or otherwise; but he continued, to his last hours, to take the warmest interest in its prosperity; and our latest communication from him was to express, in terms which we may not repeat, the gratification which he said he felt in the course we had taken respecting the Oxford Tract theology; which he added was but a revivification in a worse form of the lethal doctrines, against which himself and the other friends above mentioned, with Mr. Scott, Dr. Milner, and many others, some of whom are still living, were contending in the early volumes of the Christian Observer. Several of the letters in the work before us refer to papers which Mr. Wilberforce wrote in the pages of this periodical, and Mr. Macaulay was about to make out a list of them for us, with those of Mr. Thornton, Mr. Venn, and others, in the earlier volumes, but was prevented by illness and other impediments. Our friend has now entered the joy of his Lord, where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest.

(*To be continued.*)

OBITUARY.

REV. DR. MARSHMAN.

We are favoured with a recent Number of the Calcutta "Conservative," in which appears the following interesting account of the late Rev. Dr. Marshman, extracted from the "Friend of India." The cause of Christianity in India owes much to Dr. Carey, Mr. Ward, and Dr. Marshman, especially in their unwearied exertions in translating the Holy Scriptures into the native languages. The history of their life and proceedings embraces some topics which would involve much discussion; but the following memoir, drawn up by a filial pen, we are happy to say, is so free from allusion to matters of controversy, that we insert it with great pleasure, without note or comment.

"The Reverend Dr. Marshman was born of humble parentage in the village of Westbury Leigh, in Wiltshire, on the 20th of April 1768, where the cottage in which he first drew breath may yet be seen. Of his family little is known, except that they traced their descent from an officer in the army of Cromwell; one of that band, who at the Restoration relinquished for conscience-sake all views of worldly aggrandisement, and retired into the country to support themselves by their own industry.

"His father, a man of strong mind, undaunted intrepidity, and inflexible integrity, past the early part of his life at sea; and was engaged in the *Hind* sloop of war, commanded by Capt. Bond, at the capture of Quebec;—the action in which the gallant Wolff fell; but shortly after, he returned to

England, determining to settle among the humble and honest manufactories of his native country; and taking up his residence in Westbury Leigh, he married and turned his attention to the Weaving trade. Hence he was subsequently unable to afford his son any education, beyond what his native village supplied, except in his own Christian principles, and he lived to see the principles he had instilled ripen into the most enlarged and active benevolence. Dr. Marshman from a very early age exhibited so extraordinary a thirst for knowledge, as to convince his family and friends that he was destined for something higher than the loom. At the age of eight, he first began a course of desultory reading; snatching every moment from labour and play to devote to his books. He has assured the writer of this memorial, that between the age of ten and eighteen he had devoured the contents of more than five hundred volumes. Thus at an early period he was enabled to lay in a vast store of knowledge, which, improved by subsequent study, made his conversation so rich and instructive. After reading through all the volumes which so humble a village could furnish, he extended his researches to a greater distance, and often travelled a dozen miles out and home to borrow a book. Having no one to direct his pursuits, he read promiscuously whatever fell in his way, with the utmost avidity. But it was to biography, and more particularly to history, that the bent of his mind was directed; so much so, indeed, that when his parents, on the death of an elder brother, endeavoured to direct his thoughts to the joys of heaven, he declared that he felt no disinclination to contemplate them, provided there was room to believe that the reading of history would not be incompatible with the pursuits of that blessed region. Among the early incidents of his life, it was long remembered in his native village, that a neighbouring clergyman passing with a friend through Westbury, while he was playing at marbles, put his reading and memory to the test, by a long series of questions upon the more ancient history of England, and declared his astonishment at the correct replies which he received to every inquiry. At the age of twelve, the clergyman of his own parish meeting him one day with a book in his pocket, too large for it to conceal, asking him several questions, and among the rest the names of the kings of Israel from the beginning to the Babylonish captivity, and being struck with the accuracy of his replies, desired him to call at his house in future for any book he might wish to read. On his reaching the house the clergyman begged he would tell him whom he thought the best preacher—the Dissenting minister of the town or himself. With the certainty [in his opinion] on the one hand, that the first named excelled, and the fear on the other of losing the promised treat, he hesitated for a moment—but determining not to purchase even this at the expense of truth, he begged to be allowed to refer him to the answer of Melville, who, when asked by Queen Elizabeth whether she or his royal mistress of Scotland excelled in beauty, replied that each was handsomest in her own kingdom, and desired him to accept that as his answer. At the age of fifteen his father sent him up to London to Mr. Cator, the bookseller in the Strand, in the hope that some path would open for his obtaining a livelihood in a sphere more congenial with his tastes than a weaver's cottage. Here he was employed on errands; but, at every interval of leisure, availed himself of the new facilities he enjoyed for reading. When sent out with parcels, he too frequently spent half his time in perusing the books with which he was charged, instead of taking them to their destination. His master declared that he could make nothing of him, and that he never would succeed as a bookseller. His life in the shop was not of the most agreeable description; and it was imbittered by the prospect of being condemned to a life of such unintellectual drudgery. On one occasion having been sent to the Duke of Grafton with three folio volumes of Clarendon's History, and several other books, he was overcome with fatigue and despondency at the tasks to which he was subjected, and walking into Westminster Hall laid down his load and began to weep. But the bitterness of his feelings soon passed off; the associations of the place with which his reading had made him familiar, crowded into his mind, and appeared to fill him with new energy: and he determined, as he has often told us, in however humble a situation he might be placed, to continue storing his mind with knowledge, till the fitting opportunity should come round for his emancipation. He returned to the country between the age of sixteen and seventeen, and resumed his manual occupations, still continuing to indulge his irrepressible thirst for reading. He now turned his attention to divinity, and made himself familiar with the works of all the most celebrated divines, without distinction of sect; and those who have enjoyed the advantage of conversing with him on re-

ligious topics cannot have failed to appreciate the industry which had given him so vast a store of knowledge. To these pursuits he added the study of Latin. The strength of mind displayed in these intellectual pursuits by one who was obliged to look for his daily bread to the labour of his own hands, will appear, on reflection, to form perhaps the most remarkable trait in his character. At the age of twenty-three he married the grand-daughter of the Rev. Mr. Clarke, the Baptist minister at Froome; and this change in his circumstances rendered him doubly anxious for a different sphere of life.

"At length the long expected opportunity turned up. The post of master in a school supported by the [Baptist] church in Broadmead, in the city of Bristol, became vacant. His friends urged him to apply for it. He came up to Bristol, underwent an examination before the committee of management, and was unanimously accepted. The salary was small—£40 a year; but it brought him into a new circle, where his energies and talent might have play. He removed to that city at the age of twenty-five, and obtained permission to devote the time not occupied in this school to one of his own. This seminary was soon crowded with pupils; it rose rapidly in public estimation, and placed him at once in circumstances of independence. Among his scholars was the late lamented and amiable Mr. Rich, the resident at Bagdad, whose work on Babylon has given him so just a celebrity. But the chief advantage of his position at Bristol was the introduction it afforded him to Dr. Ryland, the president of the Baptist academy. He entered as a student in that seminary, and devoted every moment which he could spare from his avocations, to study under so able a master. He applied diligently to the Greek and Hebrew languages; and subsequently added to them Arabic and Syriac, in which his attainments, though not profound, were greatly above mediocrity. In this congenial course of improvement he passed six of the happiest years of his life. By the advice of Dr. Ryland he prepared himself for the ministry, for which his great theological reading had well fitted him, and there was every prospect of his becoming an ornament to the denomination, in his native land, with which he was associated. But a nobler field of exertion was now opened before him; for which, in the economy of Providence, this previous training appears evidently to have been intended to prepare him."

We have overrun our limits, and must therefore postpone the remainder to allow a small space for Public Affairs.

(*To be continued.*)

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE unhappy affairs of Ireland continue to occupy much of public attention. Mr. Colquhoun has exhibited in the House of Commons a fearful account of the horrible outrages against the peaceable Protestant inhabitants; on which we shall not dilate, as we have anticipated in a former page much that we might have said, by the aid of the pen of a friend resident upon the spot. The catalogue of blood which he has extracted from the Standard newspaper (though there are some errors in the figures) is appalling beyond expression; and he corroborates the detail from his own personal information. And yet we are told that Ireland is in a state of peace! We wish we could hope that the Poor-law Bill, which is now in the House of Lords, would tend to benefit the country; but we fear that it will do it irreparable injury, making paupers, but not increasing either work or bread; ruining every species of property, and demoralizing the people even below their present state of degradation.

The Irish scheme of education has been brought before the House of Lords by the Bishop of Exeter, who has proved, beyond contradiction, that as a scheme of combined education for Romanists and Protestants it has failed: that it has injured Protestantism, and encouraged Popery; and that the amendments proposed by the Commissioners are not adequate. We are grieved that the House decided against the Bishop's propositions, though the Duke of Wellington, and others who voted in the majority, acknowledged the facts on which they were based.

In the House of Commons a strong effort has been made, upon the motion of Sir Thomas Acland, to rescind the resolutions of a former parliament for appropriating the property of the Irish Church to other than its legitimate uses; but though the Conservative body displayed great strength, her Majesty's Ministers secured a small majority in favour of those party resolutions, which they have never ventured to act upon; but which offer a standing temptation to commence the work of church rob-

bery, whenever circumstances shall appear favourable to the experiment.

The West India Apprenticeship question is far from being settled. Strenuous efforts have been made to effect the immediate abolition of the apprenticeship, by the influence of public meetings and petitions; and even in the House of Commons Sir E. Wilmot carried a motion having that object, though a counter-motion has since quashed it. We reprobated in the strongest manner, from the first, the apprenticeship system; but at this late hour, we cannot but think it best for the ultimate welfare of the apprentice, that the arrangement entered into should not now be disturbed; but that the abolition law should be duly enforced, and where insufficient strengthened, so that there may be full security that the apprentice shall be treated with justice and humanity, and the whole system be extinguished in 1840, without heart-burnings or explosion.

We are much concerned to record, that Mr. Plumptre has been obliged, by the hostility of some, and the coldness and sophistry of others, to withdraw his very moderate and useful bill for abolishing Sunday trading: with liberty indeed, to bring it forward, in what Sir R. Peel calls an improved form, if he can so mould it; but evidently with a general understanding, that improvement is impracticable, and that the whole measure is ill-advised. We feel convinced that upon every principle of sound policy, as well as Christian duty, (and we would never separate them) the legislature ought to aid the settlement of this great question; but at present we see little hope of any beneficial enactment. The friends of the measure ought not however to despond; and they have this consolation, that even if they continue for a time to fail in improving the law, they may do much in improving practice; and if the nation is once brought to take up the question upon principle and a sense of duty, suitable legislation will not long be wanting.

We rejoice in the success which has attended Dr. Chalmers's lectures on Church Establishments, the good effects of which may be judged of by the extraordinary outburst of abuse and calumny which has assailed this eminent man, whose meekness and humility are even more conspicuous than his eminent talents and overwhelming eloquence. Dissent must grievously lack scriptural arguments, when it unites itself with Popery, Radicalism, and Infidelity, to vituperate so eminent a champion of the common faith; whom Mr. O'Connell at the Anti-Church-Rate meeting, pronounced guilty of blasphemy, and was applauded for it by the combined evangelical and Socinian Dissenters.

Sir Peregrine Maitland has resigned his office of Commander-in-Chief at Madras, because he will not coerce others, or be coerced himself, to minister at the pagan rites of the natives of India, whom it is our duty as Christians to endeavour to enlighten and Christianize, and not to abet their idolatry for the sake of filthy lucre. We trust that Sir Peregrine's self-sacrificing and truly Christian conduct, will, by the blessing of God, be the means of bringing this question to an issue. There requires but a resolute effort upon the part of every true patriot and Christian, to force the East India directors and proprietors, with one stroke of the pen, to put an end to this great wickedness.

We are constrained to pass over the approaching Coronation of our beloved Queen:—the close junction of England with America, by the rapid intercourse of steam-ships, which is likely to be attended with very important results:—the death of Prince Talleyrand, who has so long acted a conspicuous part in the changeful tragedies of modern Europe; and many other topics. We must not however omit to express our gratitude to God for the late blessed meetings of the Religious Societies. We rejoice to find that they have been, for the most part, peaceful and highly prosperous. The income of the Church Missionary Society has advanced to nearly eighty-two thousand pounds; of the Bible Society we need say nothing, as the highly interesting speeches, with a brief analysis of the report, are stitched up with our number; the Pastoral Aid Society has augmented with a rapidity which shews how much its efforts were needed, and greatly they have been blessed; the Lord's Day Society is poor in money, but rich in good fruits; but we must not proceed with the list. Let us thank God and take courage.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

E. L. A.; J. H.; W. D. V.; Pastor O.; B. M.; J. W.; A New Subscriber; R. M.; Miles; T. G. T.; Ελπις; W. P. S.; Rho; C. Q.; Micaiah; and E. D.; are under consideration.

We fear we cannot insert so long a series of papers as those of "three score years and ten." We feel greatly encouraged by the continued warm expressions of attachment of this and other aged Correspondents.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 7. JULY. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ON OUR LORD'S TEMPTATION.

For the Christian Observer.

IN reading the remarkable account of our Lord's temptation which the Evangelists record, the first thought which naturally presents itself to the mind is, Why did our blessed Lord submit to this indignity and suffering? And the answer doubtless must be, that the temptation was a necessary ingredient in his atoning sacrifice. The grand object of our Lord's incarnation, life, and death, was to offer an atoning and propitiatory sacrifice to the justice of the Divine administration for the guilt of our apostate race, and, in order to this, it was necessary that He should submit to every humiliation to which man is subject; that, as the Great Leader of His people, He should encounter and overcome every temptation which is common to man; and that, in a similar conflict, and with the same antagonist by whom the first Adam was vanquished, He, the second Adam, should come off more than conqueror; thus bruising the serpent's head even in the act of bruising His heel.

But the epistle to the Hebrews adds another motive for the temptation—namely, that Christ should be a merciful, as well as faithful High Priest, touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and, in that He suffered being tempted, able to succour them that are tempted.

Our Lord's temptation, too, furnishes unequivocal proof of the reality of Satanic agency;—a truth practically discredited, yet of vast importance. For if indeed Satan, like a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour, it is evident that without a deep conviction of this truth we shall never put ourselves in a posture of cautious and adequate defence. Now our Lord's temptation furnishes a model of the triple temptation with which Satan will assail our three-fold nature, and of the preparation necessary to an effectual resistance. It points out the weapon with which we should contend—"the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God;" and the victory which, if we be faithful to Divine Grace and to ourselves, will infallibly crown our earnest and humble efforts.

In considering this most interesting and remarkable passage in the history of our blessed Lord, furnishing as it does many fruitful topics for devout meditation and useful practical application, I shall, in this

paper, confine myself to a few preliminary observations of an obvious and general character, and take another opportunity for considering more particularly the details of the temptation.

The first topic which presents itself for our consideration, is the time when the temptation occurred. Our Lord had just submitted to the rite of baptism as our substitute, and thus stood forth as the scape-goat, charged with the guilt of an apostate and perishing world, which was thus typically washed away in the laver of regeneration. On thus entering upon the work of redemption his Heavenly Father acknowledges Him with distinguished honours, confers upon him distinguished privileges, and thus testifies his high approval of the work which he had undertaken. The heavens were opened unto Him: the Spirit of God descended in a bodily shape like a dove, and lighted upon Him: and a voice from heaven testified, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Such were the circumstances which immediately preceded our Lord's temptation. Immediately after it we find that He entered actively upon his ministry. From the wilderness, we are told by St. Luke, "Jesus returned, in the power of the Spirit, into Galilee; and there went out a fame of Him into all the region round about; and He taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all." He followed up that conquest which he had gained over Satan in the wilderness, by proceeding to destroy the two principal works of the devil—sin, and its inseparable attendant, misery: "They brought unto Him those that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy, and he healed them." And when the fame of His power and benevolence had gathered around Him, as he travelled along, "great multitudes from Galilee, and Decapolis, and Jerusalem, and Judea, and from beyond Jordan," He addressed them in that discourse which we call the Sermon on the Mount, and which contains the most profound, and yet the simplest, epitome of moral truth to be found even in the inspired Scriptures.

Our Lord's temptation then occurred immediately after His baptism—after distinguished honours and privileges had been conferred upon Him—and immediately before He entered upon a powerful ministry of wide-spread fame and extensive usefulness.

In transferring this experience from our Great Exemplar, and practically applying it to His followers and true disciples, it may be remarked, that so surely as we set ourselves to fulfil the engagements of our baptismal covenant; so surely as we are baptized, not with water only, but with the Holy Ghost; so surely shall we have to encounter, and should therefore prepare to meet, the temptations and assaults of Satan.

In baptism we profess to renounce the world, the flesh, and the devil; and so long as this is confined to mere profession, so long as there is no effort at performance, Satan will not molest or disturb us: "while the strong man armed keepeth his palace his goods will be in peace." But the moment the Divine Spirit has sounded in the ears of conscience, or of our inner man, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead;" the moment we begin to think seriously about the interests of our immortal souls, and the concerns of eternity; the moment we attempt to stem the torrent of an apostate world, and to deny the solicitations of a corrupt nature; and resolve,

at whatever cost, to quit the broad and thronged way that leads to destruction, and to live godly in Christ Jesus; then we shall suffer persecution, and be exposed to daily trials and temptations from our own corrupt nature, from Satan's agents in the world, and from his immediate suggestions to our souls. And so inevitable is this consequence, that if any man has not proved it by his own experience, it can only be because he is still in his natural and unawakened state; dead in trespasses and sins; the passive, unresisting, willing slave of the great enemy of God and man.

From the fact that our Lord's temptation occurred immediately after the honours and privileges conferred upon Him, and before His entrance upon so glorious a ministry, we may take occasion to remark, that it is God's usual mode of dealing with souls, to follow up the honours and privileges which He confers upon His people with humiliations—and by humiliations to prepare them for fresh honours and privileges, and more extensive usefulness. And there is an evident cause for this. Such is the corruption of man's fallen nature, that God, as a skilful Physician of the soul, is obliged, even in mercy, to keep this feverish patient low; and lest even the faithful discharge of duty should influence his pride, and thus draw him into the snare and condemnation of the devil, to temper not only the bounties of Providence but the blessings of Grace, not only the gifts but the graces of His Spirit, with humiliations. When St. Paul was caught up into the third heavens, and heard those unspeakable words which it is not possible for man to utter, lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was sent a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, to buffet him. When Peter, on his confession of Christ, heard from the lips of his Divine Master the blessing which that good confession sealed and elicited; accompanied with that strong declaration upon which the apostate church has based its despotism, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" to neutralize the poison which his still worldly and ambitious spirit might have extracted from it, our Lord, in the very same conversation, addresses him in language of the severest reproof which, except to Judas, He is recorded to have uttered, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." And thus, often does the child of God wonder why it is that, when he is most faithful to Divine grace, and walking most closely with God, trials and temptations which disturb and discompose him are permitted to cross his path. He forgets that this is the very time when Satan is peculiarly anxious to assail him as a prisoner bursting his bonds; and therefore that these temptations, instead of disheartening him, should stimulate his faith, his hope, his love. He forgets too that thus it is "God answers prayer for faith and love:" that this is designed to wean his affections from things below, and to set them upon things above: to keep down the swellings of pride: to shew him his own weakness and misery: to accustom him to fly to the bosom of his heavenly Father for consolation and support: to make prayer habitual and familiar: and to compel him to put to himself that important and but too necessary question, "Who made

thee to differ from another? What hast thou that thou didst not receive?"

Nor is it less evident from experience that God usually fits his people for more abundant outpourings of his Spirit, and trains them to eminent usefulness, in the school of temptation and suffering; thus mortifying that pride of heart which would appropriate even God's gifts, and so convert even grace into poison. Take up any volume of Christian biography, and you will scarcely find an example on record of an eminent saint who did not pass to his crown through deep waters of temptation. And with respect to the connexion which God seems to have established between privileges and humiliations, temptations and usefulness, we cannot but observe, that the three Apostles, Peter, James, and John, who were selected to be witnesses of the raising of Jairus's daughter, and of the transfiguration, were also selected to be witnesses of the agony in the garden of Gethsemane: as if the one was designed to strengthen their faith, and prepare them for the other—and that, after passing through that deep trial of faith, they were evidently called to occupy a place in the church of higher dignity and more extensive usefulness than any other of the twelve.

We are led by these considerations to remark, that the Christian warfare is an alternation of trials and comforts, temptations and supports, rather than a direct and immediate conflict between present temptations and present communications of grace. If God's plan were to meet each temptation with a proportionate present supply of grace, man's soul would be but the passive theatre of a conflict between God and Satan; and thus his active participation, in fact his moral agency and moral accountability, would be destroyed. It is true that there is a blessed promise to the people of God, that as their day is, so shall their strength be; and that God will not suffer them to be tempted above that they are able. The question is not as to the fulfilment of this rich promise, but as to the mode of its fulfilment, which I conceive to be this: God, who foresees each temptation, provides against it, by furnishing the soul with adequate previous communications of grace. These, if received, transform, and become, as it were, a part of the soul itself. They then become, as our Lord emphatically calls them, in contradistinction to means and privileges however excellent, *our own*. "If ye be not faithful in that which is another's, who shall give you that which is your own?" They are a treasure—a strength, which God has bestowed upon us, and given us grace also to receive and to lay up, on which, in the hour of need, we may draw to counteract the present temptation. But it must surely be evident, that it is not when we are strongly tempted to any sinful temper or affection that the opposite grace is in most lively and vigorous exercise. It is not when we are strongly tempted to unbelief, to irritability, to despondency, to discontent, to sensuality, that faith, that meekness, that hope, that resignation, that purity, are in their most lively exercise. No; at such moments of temptation our call is to fall back upon and rally to those principles of Divine truth, which we had treasured up in more favourable seasons, and to beseech of God that He would bring them into action, and render them effectual in counteracting the present temptation: to rally to a lively sense of the all-importance of eternal, and the comparative nothingness of temporal, things; of the heinousness of sin, and of the vast, the infinite price which it cost to redeem our souls; of the constant and heart-inspecting presence of a Holy God;

and, above all, to rally to that spirit of adoption which it is the privilege of every Christian to possess, and which witnesseth with our spirit, that we are the children of God: which addresses to each Christian, in his degree, those cheering words with which our Lord, at his baptism, was strengthened for His temptation, and encouraged to enter upon his self-denying, suffering life: "Thou art my beloved Son: in Thee I am well pleased." Yes, it is a sense of pardoning love; it is the view of God, as a Father, reconciled in Christ, which alone can soften the hard heart of man, bend his proud and stubborn spirit, and gain admission for the light of truth into his self-deluded conscience: which can shew him the baseness, the ingratitude, as well as the misery of disobedience: which can teach the humblest penitent to abhor himself, to abhor sin; and at the foot of that cross, upon whose altar the Lamb of God bled and agonized for *his* sake, to immolate the love of sin, at the very moment in which he is receiving a free pardon of it, and casting down his burden: and there, in the pure flame of Divine and holy love, to dedicate body, soul, and spirit, a free-will offering to his Father and his God. Yes, it is that spirit which cries Abba, Father, which will most effectually withstand temptation; which will destroy the resources, and thus wither the arm of the tempter; and which will bear the soul most comfortably through the sufferings of life, and most securely through the snares and temptations of the world.

Nor let it be thought that this description of the Christian warfare, as an alternation of trials and supports, rather than a conflict of present grace with present temptation, is a mere metaphysical subtlety. It is of most important practical benefit, in its bearing upon the right use of the various means of grace. It prevents us from attaching to them a superstitious value, as though they were so many incantations and charms, whose mere use was beneficial, by recommending us, we know not why, or how, to the Divine favour. It teaches us that the choicest means are but weak and beggarly elements, unless we view them as means, and not as an end; and extract from them, and treasure up in our own hearts against the hour of temptation, that grace which they were designed of God to be the channel of conveying to the soul.

The place also of our Lord's temptation, "the wilderness," suggests some interesting and important reflections. The wilderness in which our Lord fasted and was tempted, is supposed to be that wilderness of Sinai, in which Moses and Elias had also fasted, each forty days and forty nights. Our Lord now retired thither, probably for this cause, that, in its solitude and silence, He might pour out those devout affections, and gratify those aspirations after intimate communion with his Heavenly Father, which the Spirit, resting upon Him at His baptism, and now leading Him thither, had excited. There is no feature of our Lord's character more prominent and characteristic than the intimacy of His communion, the closeness of His walk, in secret prayer, with God. Devotion was the atmosphere which He habitually breathed, the congenial element in which alone His soul could live: add these labours of love, in which piety found suitable expression, and say truly of Him, "Prayer all his business, all His pleasure praise." How often do we find Him, after a day passed in active and laborious duties, so that He had not time so much as to eat, in healing the sick, feeding the hungry, instructing the ignorant; in toilsome journeyings; and most of all wearisome to His peaceful

spirit, in conflicting with the Scribes and Pharisees in the temple, —how often, I say, do we find Him, after such a day of toil and bustle, seeking the refreshment, not of sleep, but of prayer, retiring to a mountain alone to pray, and there spending the whole night in prayer to God? He, indeed, and He alone, was the living original from which the Christian poet could faithfully copy his portrait of a perfect Christian,

> "Whose hours divided are
> Between the mount and multitude;
> His days are spent in doing good,
> His nights in praise and prayer."

Nor would I here merely enforce, as from our Lord's general practice, the importance of cultivating secret prayer; but, from the particular instance before us, I would urge the necessity of preparing to meet any expected trial or temptation, by spreading our case before the Lord in earnest secret prayer, thus engaging the protection of the Divine arm; and also, by watching carefully, not to dissipate, but on the contrary to deepen, the impressions which may have been produced in us by any means of grace. Those moments, when the mind has been religiously impressed, when the conscience has been quickened, the heart softened, and the affections weaned from earth, and elevated to holy and heavenly things, are the golden moments of life, in which not only our strength against future temptation is to be acquired, but also our treasures for eternity are to be gathered: these, therefore, it should be our earnest study to cherish and prolong. And, in this view, we should be careful, when the public services of religion are concluded, not to make the house of God a scene of greetings and frivolous conversation, which must inevitably dissipate any profitable impression that the ordinances may have produced.

Sometimes when one looks around upon a congregation attentively engaged by a faithful and powerful exposition of God's word, and observes the deep impression which has been produced—sees many an eye suffused with tears, and witnesses an absorbed attention, a solemn reverence, which seem to say, "This is none other than the house of God: and this is the gate of Heaven:" when the fondest wish of Christian charity would be that the congregation would ever continue what it then was, so impressed, so serious, so devout; that God would then stamp it with its character for eternity; and yet, when one follows the individuals of that congregation from the sanctuary into the world, and observes the levity and worldliness into which they again quickly relapse, one is tempted to ask in wonder, Why is it that men are thus ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth? why are so many impressed by the Divine ordinances, and so few converted? or if indeed they have crossed the threshold of justification, why there is so little progress in the heavenward course, so little growth in grace and in the knowledge of God? In fact, why is it that so few are edified and built up in their most holy faith, and, growing up unto Christ which is the Head in all things, of babes become young men, of young men fathers, thus gradually attaining unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ? But a glance at the congregation, dispersing with unseemly haste, with laughter, and light or wordly conversation, at once solves the mystery. It tells that Satan is not idle in our churches: that on a meeting professedly assembled for serious and devotional purposes, he has grafted another

with far different objects: a meeting in which each preaches vanity and worldliness to his neighbour, and like the birds of the air, in the parable by which our Lord illustrates this very subject, picks up the good seed sown in his heart lest he should believe and be saved. How different would be the result of impressions produced by the ordinances of religion, if each were to retain his place in the congregation until he could retire from it quietly and without interruption, and in that "peace of God which passeth all understanding," with which the minister of God dismissed him: if he would then retire to his home and to his closet, and, either in serious conversation with his family upon the sacred subjects with which he has been just occupied, or in secret meditation and prayer, would seek to perpetuate and deepen in his own bosom, and to diffuse amid all around, those religious impressions of which, through the Divine blessing upon the ordinances, he has been made the subject.

Two more observations of a general character our subject naturally elicits; one, that our Lord did not rush into this temptation carelessly, presumptuously, or without preparation, but was brought into it by the arrangements of Providence and Grace. "Jesus was *led* up of the Spirit"—that Spirit which had just lighted upon Him—"into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil." And let me here observe, that while we daily pray, and are taught and commanded so to pray, "Lead us not into temptation," we should take good heed that we do not convert this prayer into a mere mockery, by using no means to keep ourselves out of it. We do but trifle with the heart-searching God, when we offer to him such a petition, and do not scrupulously avoid every person, place, or practice, which we have found by experience to draw us into it. We must in this matter be sincere, if we would be without offence, in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The other observation is, that our Lord's temptation was a direct and immediate suggestion of the devil. Our Lord, on another occasion, says, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." There was no evil affection in the pure bosom of our Lord on which the tempter could lay hold; no evil passion, no root of bitterness, on which to graft corruption. Our Lord was made and tempted like as we are in all things, yet without sin, so that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, touched with a feeling of our infirmities; and now suffered being tempted, that He might be able to succour and sympathize with those who are tempted. But our temptation too frequently differs from our Lord's in this, that we are tempted, not merely by the tempting, sinful object being presented, and appealing to us, but when, as St. James describes the process, and defines the sin of temptation, "We are drawn away of our own lust, and enticed."

And here, curiosity would prompt us to inquire, What was the precise nature of our Lord's temptation? But this were to enter upon a delicate and mysterious subject, wholly beyond man's moral reach: Two great truths are clearly revealed concerning it, and should be received in all the fulness of their plain and literal import. First, that Christ was very man, made in our nature, tempted like as we are: and next, that this temptation left, as it had found, His pure soul without a single taint of sin. Not only could He submit His life to the scrutiny of His bitterest enemies, and say, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" but He could open the deep recesses of His

bosom, invite the Holy and heart-seeing God to search and prove Him, and then say, "I have glorified Thee."

To suppose our Lord, as many practically do, without human feelings, passions, and affections, is to deny that He was man: and not only derogates from the sufferings of His atonement, but also intercepts those softening and sanctifying influences which would flow from a sense of His sufferings, and those consolations from a sense of His sympathy. Christ was not only "very God," but also very man: and His Divine nature, instead of paralyzing or absorbing His human nature, communicated to it a more refined and intense sensibility to every congenial appeal, and a more enlarged capability of admitting it. To constitute temptation, the object must appeal to sympathetic passions and affections; but the consent of the will is necessary to constitute sin; and this consent was never, for a single moment, yielded by or extorted from our Blessed Lord.

But still two questions recur. First, In what degree was His serene bosom even harassed or disturbed by the inroads of temptation and the assaults of Satan? And here I think Scripture plainly implies, that our Lord's temptation was precisely similar to that of His people; but with this aggravating circumstance, that His individual experience combined the full experience of all His saints; for otherwise one great end of His temptation—universal sympathy—would not have been attained. He suffered, we are told, being tempted, that He might be able to succour them which are tempted. If, therefore, we could accurately define the line of demarcation where the mere suffering of temptation ends and the sin commences, we should ascertain that point of temptation to which our Lord condescended to stoop. And we should then remember that his sensitive, capacious, and holy soul must have endured temptations and sufferings, and rallied to corresponding graces and supports, on a scale of magnitude which it hath not entered into the heart of mere man to conceive, but which became the great Captain of our salvation, the model and the succourer of a tempted world. All His temptations, up to the moment of that last mysterious agony upon the cross, He suffered, in His degree, as do the children of God, when, like Daniel, they walk through the flames of this spiritual martyrdom cheered by sensible manifestations of the Divine presence. In that mysterious agony, when the channel which hitherto conveyed the fulness of the Divine consolations into His world-crucified, self-denying, suffering soul, was obstructed, and the horrors of that great darkness of spiritual desertion, at which His devout soul shuddered, filled Him with strange misgivings and awful fears, and wrung from Him that piercing, agonized cry, "My God! my God! why hast Thou forsaken me!" then he suffered, in His degree, as do the children of God, when it pleases their Heavenly Father to lead them into deep waters, and to cause all His waves and storms to pass over them; while yet, for the punishment of their sins, for the exercise of their patience, for the perfecting of their faith, and for the purpose of eliciting the voice of earnest, importunate, persevering prayer, He withholds from them the comforts of His sensible presence and supporting aid.

The second question is, Did every object of temptation which appeals to the nature of man appeal to that of our Lord also? But let us pause! A voice from within whispers, Draw not nigh thither! The place whereon thou standest is holy ground! Presume not to

lift the veil of sanctity, and to look upon the dazzling splendours of that inaccessible light which skreens from profane gaze this Holy of Holies, and which revelation has not seen fit to draw aside and mitigate. Let us, with the Cherubim, veil our faces, nor dare to pry into the mysterious recesses, the awful purities of that Holy Soul!

J. M. H.

SCRIPTURE PHRASEOLOGY TO BE USED IN SPEAKING OF THE OFFICES OF CHRIST.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In your last Number, page 401, occurs a quotation from Hooker, in which that generally judicious divine says: "Man hath sinned and *God hath suffered*;" and at page 338 of the same Number, your correspondent J. M. H. says, that "the hands of the Omnipotent were bound with cords by his own rebellious creatures." Assuredly such expressions are not Scriptural—God cannot suffer; Omnipotence cannot be bound. The first article of our Church justly declares that God is "without body, parts, or passions;" being therefore without body, we cannot speak of his material hands being bound with material cords; and being passionless, we cannot speak of his "passion," that is, his suffering: "the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary." Our Lord himself says, "God is a spirit;" but, "behold my hands and my feet ..... a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." A spirit has not hands to be bound; or flesh to suffer; but "Christ suffered in the flesh." The sacred writers, while they declare the Deity of our Lord, so word their declaration as to show that it was not the Deity which suffered. Thus, "Christ hath once suffered for sins .... that he might bring us to God;" not "God hath suffered to bring us to God." And again, "God had sworn .... that he would raise up Christ." "We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son;" not the death of God. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself ..... He made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." This inspired language ought to be our model, rather than certain strong expressions of the ancient Fathers; who, because the Catholic church has ever held the doctrine of the Trinity, which is most clearly set forth in Scripture, seemed to consider themselves justified in using interchangeably expressions which Scripture does not warrant; as if they could make what is *infinitely* wonderful more wonderful by paradoxical phraseology.

Our second article expresses the matter Scripturally: "The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father; the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature, &c." "Whereof is one Christ, (very God and very man,) who truly suffered, was dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." It may be said that this comes to the same; for though it is Christ who is said to have suffered, Christ is declared to be very God. To this I reply, that even if it were the same, we should still keep to Scripture language in so high a mystery; but in truth it is *not* the same. I cannot pretend to adduce a parallel by way of illustration, as there is nothing parallel to it in the annals of earth or

heaven; but a familiar remark may shew what I mean. We might say that "the Bishop of A., who is Lord B.'s son, is holding an episcopal visitation;" but we should not say that Lord B.'s son is holding an episcopal visitation.

PHILOLOGUS.

REMINISCENCES OF BISHOP HALL. No. II.

(*Continued from page* 357.)

WE left the good Bishop preparing (as he says) to "take the Tower in his way" to the new dignity of Norwich, which his unfortunate master had just power enough left to bestow upon him. Their common enemies, however, took care to place a thorn in this nest; for while the irreligious among them, both in and out of the church, could not endure either the Bishop's faithful preaching, or his open encouragement of evangelical lecturers, whenever he could set them up, or keep them up; so the enemies of Episcopacy could as ill tolerate the able vindication of his own particular order, and of ecclesiastical order in general, which he was constantly supplying, both in his arguments and his practice. Not all the harmony of one kind, which was admitted to exist between himself and the Puritans, as appearing in all that he inculcated from the pulpit and the press (so utterly unlike the Arminianism of Bishop Laud) could atone, with many, for the unflinching zeal displayed by him in defence of the Reformed Liturgy and of Church discipline, more especially as opposed to the work of *Smectymnuus;* a title composed of the initials of the names of the principal champions opposed to him. As Hall boldly pursued this course when the republican party had possessed themselves of the fortresses of civil and ecclesiastical government, it was no wonder that when they could substitute power for argument, they made him experience the dangers of high station. Within two months from his translation to Norwich, he was (on 30th January, 1641,) sent, with twelve other prelates, to the Tower, at eight o'clock at night, in a severe frost, for having simply protested against the validity of such laws as should be made during their compelled absence from Parliament. The Commons then impeached them of high treason, and treated them, on their appearance, with the utmost rudeness and contempt; but the impeachment was soon dropped, as the immediate object of their exclusion from the House of Lords had been gained. They were, however, again sent to the Tower on a charge of Premunire, nor was it till the following June that Hall was finally released, on giving bail for £5000!

In his beautiful letter from the Tower (afterwards printed) he half-humorously observes—"My *intentions,* and *this place,* are such strangers, that I cannot enough marvel how they met, but" (he most piously adds) "I do, in all humility, kiss the rod wherewith I smart; as well knowing whose hand it is that wields it. To that Infinite Justice, who can be innocent? but to my king and country, never heart was, or can be, more clear. I can secretly arraign and condemn myself of infinite transgressions before the tribunal of heaven: who that dwells in a house of clay can be pure in His sight that charges His angels with folly? O God, when I look upon the reckonings betwixt Thee and my soul, and find my shameful arrears, I can be most vile in my

own sight, because I have deserved to be so in thine; yet, even then, in thy most pure eyes give me leave, the while, not to abdicate my sincerity. Thou knowest my heart desires to be right with thee, whatever my failings may have been; and I know what value thou puttest upon those sincere desires, notwithstanding all the intermixtures of our miserable infirmities. These I can penitently bewail to thee: but what have I done to men?"

His examination of the offences imputed by his opponents, although too long for insertion, is highly interesting, but chiefly for the excellent spirit in which it is compiled; and he thus concludes—"Knowing nothing whereby I have deserved to alienate any good heart from me, I shall resolve to rest securely upon the acquitting testimony of a good conscience, and the secret approbation of my gracious God, who shall one day cause mine innocence to break forth as the morning light, and shall give me beauty for bands, and for a light and momentary affliction, an eternal weight of glory."

He now repaired to Norwich, where, in spite of the turbulency of the times, he found great acceptance, preaching constantly to crowded audiences, and tolerated in the main by the dominant party, till April, 1643, when it was evident that the destruction of the church could be delayed no longer. He was now included by name in the Ordinance of the Commons "for sequestering notorious delinquents,"—a distinction to which his writings and popularity had justly entitled him. Upon this, his rents were stopped, even the half year then due, and the sequestrators immediately entered his palace, and began the work of devastation with unfeeling brutality; seizing his whole property both real and personal. In addition to his "Letter from the Tower," we have his own account of this treatment, entitled "*Hard Measure*," where, after observing that "nothing could be more plain than that, upon the call of that Parliament and before, there was a general plot and resolution of the faction to alter the government of the church," he observes: "It was contrived to draw accusatory petitions from many parts of the kingdom against Episcopal Government, and the promoters of the petitions were entertained with great respect; whereas, the many petitions of the opposite part, though subscribed with many thousand hands, were slighted and disregarded."

On one night, in particular, such was the popular fury, and so loud the cry of "No Bishops," that he says it was with the greatest difficulty that the Prelates could escape from the House with their lives. This was followed, as has been said, by their commitment to the Tower, on a charge of high treason, for petitioning the king and parliament, that since they were legally summoned to give their attendance there, they might be protected in the performance of their duty against the dangers that threatened them, and, at all events, might not be held responsible for acts passed in their absence. The news, he says, of this imprisonment was entertained with ringing of bells, and bonfires, and followed by scurrilous and malicious pamphlets, both at home and abroad. A bill was now passed, which had been twice rejected before, for taking away the Bishops' votes, to which the poor king assented. It is interesting to learn from this document of "Hard Measure," that during these unjust imprisonments in the Tower, which lasted from New Year's Eve to Whitsuntide, the several Bishops preached in turn, every Lord's day, to a large auditory of citizens!

But to return to the Bishop's treatment at Norwich.

"The sequestrators," he observes, "sent certain men appointed by them (whereof one had been burned in the hand) to appraise all the goods that were in my house: which they executed with all diligent severity, not leaving so much as a dozen of trenchers or my children's pictures out of their inventory: yea, they would have apprized (appraised) our very wearing apparel, had not some of them declared their opinion to the contrary. These goods, both library and household stuff of all kinds, were ordered for public sale; but Mrs. Goodwin, a religious gentlewoman, whom yet we had never known or seen, being moved with compassion, very kindly offered to lay down to the sequestrators the whole sum the goods were valued at; and was pleased to leave them in our hands, for our use, till we might be able to repurchase them. As for the books, several stationers looked on them, but were not forward to buy. At last Mr. Cooke, a worthy divine of this diocese, gave bond to the sequestrators, to pay them the whole sum whereat they were set: which was afterwards satisfied out of that poor pittance which was allowed me for my maintenance."

This "poor pittance" had at first the appearance of liberality, for when he applied to the Committee of Sequestrators at Norwich, they were either so ashamed of what they had been compelled to do, or entertained so much respect for his character, as to agree that he should have 400*l.* a year out of the revenues of the bishopric. But, before he could obtain a single quarter, their employers at the seat of government disdained to vary their proceedings by such an act of generosity, and the Norwich Committee were told that they had no power to allow any thing, but if his wife needed a maintenance, upon her application to the Parliamentary Committee, she might receive a fifth part. After long delays, this was granted; but the sequestrators produced such confused accounts that the Bishop could never ascertain what a fifth part meant, and was obliged to take what they offered. And that even this pittance might wear the appearance of insult and persecution, after they had sold all his goods and personal estate, they were not ashamed to demand assessments and monthly payments for the very estates they had seized, and levied distresses upon him in spite of every assurance that he had given up all. They even commanded him to find the arms usually furnished by his predecessors, when they had left him nothing.

Under these increasing afflictions he still continued to exercise his power of ordaining ministers, no law yet forbidding it; but now "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort," who could "find no occasion against (this) Daniel except concerning the law of his God," stirred up the Mayor and Corporation of Norwich to charge him with an open violation of the celebrated Covenant which had been appointed to be taken both by the clergy and laity. He was therefore called upon by a deputation, in a most offensive manner, and at an unseasonable time, and both challenged for violating the Covenant and ordered to furnish a list of all whom he had ordained both before and since it passed. Considering this as an affair of conscience between himself and God only, he refused, and was accordingly cited to answer, in person, before the Corporation; but modestly enquiring of his visitants "when they ever heard of a Bishop of Norwich appearing before a Mayor," and adding that "he knew his own place, and would take that way of answer which he thought fit," they retired, but not before they had openly declared that "if they had known before of his ordaining, they would have pulled him, and those whom he ordained, out of the chapel by the ears." It is important to record these traits of hostility, as demonstrating the spirit by which these unhappy men were guided, and evincing the real nature of the quarrel which they had with the Bishop.

But let him proceed awhile with his own simple narrative:—

"Many insolences and affronts were, in all this time, put upon us. One while, a whole rabble of volunteers came to my gates late, when they were locked up, and called for the porter to give them entrance: which being not yielded, they threatened to make by force; and, had not the gates been very strong, they had done it. Others of them clambered over the walls, and would come into my house; their errand, they said, was to search for delinquents; what they would have done I know not, had not we by a secret way sent to raise the officers for our rescue. Another while, a Sheriff and an Alderman, attended with many zealous followers, came into my chapel, to look for superstitious pictures, and relics of idolatry; and sent for me, to let me know they found those windows full of images, which were very offensive and must be demolished. I told them they were the pictures of some ancient and worthy bishops, as St. Ambrose, Austin, &c. It was answered me that they were so many popes; and one younger man amongst the rest would take upon him to defend that every diocesan bishop was a pope. I answered him with some scorn; and obtained leave that I might, with the least loss and defacing of the windows, give order for taking off that offence; which I did, by causing the heads of those pictures to be taken off, since I knew the bodies could not offend.

"There was not that care and moderation used in reforming the cathedral church bordering upon my palace. It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege, whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses, under the authority and presence of the Sheriff and Aldermen. Alas! what work was here! what clattering of glasses! what beating down of walls! what tearing up of monuments! what pulling down of seats! what wresting out of irons and brass from the windows and graves! what defacing of arms! what demolishing of curious stonework, that had not any representation in the world, but only of the cost of the founder and skill of the mason! what piping upon the destroyed organ pipes! and what a hideous triumph on the market-day before all the country, when, in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ-pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross which had been newly sawn down from over the Green-yard pulpit, and the service books and singing books that could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market-place; a lewd wretch walking before the train, in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service-book in his hand, imitating in an impious scorn, the tune, and usurping the words, of the Litany used formerly in the Church. Near the public Cross, all these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire; not without much ostentation of a zealous joy, in discharging ordnance, to the cost of some, who professed how much they had longed to see that day. Neither was it any news upon this Guild-day to have the cathedral, now open on all sides, to be filled with musketeers, waiting for the Major's return, drinking and smoking tobacco as freely as if it had turned alehouse.

"Still yet I remained in my palace, though with but a poor retinue and means; but the house was held too good for me. Many messages were sent by Mr. Miles Corbet to remove me thence. The first pretence was, that the Committee, who now was at charge for a house to sit in, might make their daily session there; being a place both more public, roomy, and chargeless. The Committee, after many consultations, resolved it convenient to remove thither; though many overtures and offers were made to the contrary. Mr. Corbet was impatient of my stay there; and procured and sent peremptory messages for my present dislodging; we desired to have some time allowed for providing some other mansion, if we must needs be cast out of this; which my wife was so willing to hold, that she offered, if the charge of the present Committee-house were the thing stood upon, she would be content to defray the sum of the rent of that house of her fifth part; but that might not be yielded: out we must, and that in three weeks' warning, by midsummer day then approaching: so as we might have lain in the street, for ought I know, had not the providence of God so ordered it that a neighbour in the Close, one Mr. Gostlin, a widower, was content to void his house for us.

"This hath been my measure; wherefore I know not: Lord, thou knowest, who only canst remedy, and end, and forgive, or avenge, this horrible oppression."

It was then that he appears to have retired to Heigham, on the western side of Norwich, which Mr. Chalmers, in his Biographical Dictionary, supposes to have been "a small estate which he rented;"

adding that "his sufferings did not damp his courage, as in 1644 we find him preaching in Norwich, wherever he could obtain the use of a pulpit; and with yet more boldness, in the same year, he sent 'A modest Offer of some meet Considerations' in favour of Episcopacy, addressed to the Assembly of divines. During the rest of his life he appears to have remained at Heigham unmolested, performing the duties of a faithful pastor, and exercising such hospitality and charity as his scanty means permitted."

It appears from Blomefield's History of Norfolk that there was no bishop of this diocese from the time of Hall, when, says he, "episcopacy suffered a great eclipse in its reputation and authority," till the excellent Reynolds was consecrated in 1660; and it was the latter who built the present chapel in the episcopal palace.

In reference to this closing scene of Bishop Hall's life, Mr. Blomefield informs us that the advowson of Heigham is appendant to the bishopric; and in 1652, after many intruders, the good bishop, who had retired to this suburban village, instituted his friend John Whitefoot into that rectory, who enjoyed it till he resigned it, in 1682, to a son of the same name, the father having preached the bishop's funeral sermon.

"If I mistake not," he says, "Bishop Hall rented the little estate at Heigham to which he retired, where "under all his sufferings, he distributed a weekly charity out of that little which was left him, to a certain number of poor widows; and kept a weekly fast, in his whole family, for the safety of his majesty's person, until they had barbarously murdered him before his own palace gate." He goes on to say:—

"This pious and excellent bishop was famous for his moderation, for which he, with some other bishops, as Usher, Prideaux, Winniff, Brownrigg, &c., are blamed by our historians as giving the disaffected in those times some advantages against the Church; yet he will appear undeserving of it, when we consider that he always made use of it to win the enemies of the Church to it; and even while he managed the controversy with them, with great strength and ability, as against the Brownists, Smectymnuus, &c., he did it with such a spirit that they could not but believe he did it in love to them and the truth; which, if they made a wrong use of it, was theirs, not his, fault, who has left us so many monuments of his learning and goodness. His works are many and voluminous, having printed fifty treatises, of which this character is given by the learned—that he was our English Seneca, dexterous at controversy, not unhappy at comments, very good at characters, better in sermons, best of all in meditations and contemplations."

"These were the sufferings, and such the character, of this meek, humble, and incomparable prelate, who died at his house at Heigham, in the western suburbs of Norwich, on the 8th September 1656, in the 82nd year of his age, and was buried in the chancel of the parish church there, privately, and without solemnity."

I had hoped to comprize the account of my visit to Heigham in this letter, but must yet crave leave to occupy a further space in your valuable work.

ZENAS.

BAXTER ON LAYMEN READING THE SCRIPTURES IN CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

BAXTER, in his Christian Directory, (third Part, on "Christian Ecclesiastics," question 149), asks, "Is the public reading of the Scripture the proper work of a minister; or may a layman ordinarily do it?" He replies, "In such cases as I before showed that a layman may preach, he may also read the Scriptures." He however considers "ordained ministers, or pastors and deacons," as the fit and proper persons. He adds: "Whether in case of necessity a layman may not ordinarily read the Scripture to the congregation, is a case that I am loth to determine, being loth to suppose such a necessity; but if the minister cannot, and there be no deacon, I cannot prove it unlawful for a layman to do it, under the direction of a pastor." He mentions the case of a minister, about eighty years of age, who never preached; and his eyesight failing, and not being able to keep a curate, "he got a tailor one year, and a thresher another, and a poor day-labourer another, to read all the Scriptures." But in his tantalizing way he only says, "Whether that were not better than nothing I leave to consideration."

The correspondents who have addressed you as to the propriety of unordained persons reading the lessons in church, will see that even Baxter thought it not "ordinarily" allowable, though he left "to consideration" whether, in case of urgent necessity, it might not be permitted, rather than the people should be left wholly uninstructed, just as he thought in such extreme cases a layman might preach. In the church of Rome it never was tolerated, and there is not one tittle of sanction for it in the Church of England.

TICHYCUS.

DEATH-BED OF MRS. SARAH MORE.

For the Christian Observer.

WHILE inserting in our Number for May, the narrative of the death-bed of Hannah More, we were reminded of the very interesting account given by Mr. Roberts of her sister Sarah, who was, in many respects, a remarkable woman, and of whom we have often lamented that our pages contained no record. We inserted in our volume for 1819, an obituary of Martha, the youngest sister, who died in her 67th year, leaving Hannah the sole survivor of the five sisters, the three eldest of whom quitted the world (as Hannah said) in the order in which they entered it, each at the advanced age of 75. Sally died in the year 1817. We knew her well, and to know her was highly to esteem and affectionately to regard her. She presented, both in body and mind, a striking contrast to Hannah and Martha. The two latter were delicate, and slightly built; the former was more massy in her frame; and her conversation, though edifying and deeply serious on serious subjects, was marked by a natural humour, both of style and manner, the like of which Garrick used to say he had never witnessed in any other woman. Meek-eyed "Patty"

(that was the household colloquialism) was all tenderness, susceptibility, and sweetness; deeply humble, and winningly unobtrusive; yet possessed of great energy of character; most zealous in her loyalty and patriotism; and indefatigable in works of piety and mercy. She was tenderly attached—as indeed they all were—to Hannah; and nothing could exceed the solicitous attention with which she watched beside her couch, or endeavoured to prevent her being disturbed or over-fatigued. As for Hannah, her character and the style of her conversation are too well known to require notice. But neither Martha's gentle vivacity, nor Hannah's sparkling wit, were so popularly effective as "Mrs. Sally's" good-humoured originalities, which often provoked more than could be called a smile. The tale of "The two Soldiers," in the cheap Repository Tracts, which was written by her, shews somewhat of her style, which was more broad and Doric than that of her Attic sister. It must have been irresistibly comic to have heard one of her characteristic dialogues with some old-fashioned churlish Somersetshire farmer, whom she was endeavouring to reconcile to the direful scheme of teaching the children of his neighbourhood to read; or with some heathenish village slattern, whom she was alluring to go to church, and to mend her husband's stockings. Rowland Hill, or John Berridge, might have envied her shrewdness. She would coin the oddest words, and express the most original ideas, and bring them out with unwonted light and shade, sometimes perhaps to the amazement of strangers, who thought that nothing was licit, under Hannah More's roof, but rounded periods and the studied phraseology of books.

In the family arrangements of Barley Wood "Mrs. Sally" was head gardener; or rather head *operative* gardener; for Hannah, we think, was most skilled in the refinements of landscape gardening, though all of them were fond both of the theory and the practice. We remember, one fine day in June, in visiting Cowslip Green, many years after the Miss Mores had left it for Barley Wood, observing in the hedges and along the lanes, as well as around the cottages, not only wild roses, but cultivated roses in full bloom; and upon asking some of the villagers how they came there, being told that the ladies who formerly lived at the Green used to plant them to adorn the neighbourhood. Our very last recollection of "Mrs. Sally" was being taken by her to inspect the green-house, then in all its—and *her*—pride; for she was a most ardent practical botanist. When we next saw it, some years afterwards, she and Martha had followed the two eldest sisters—most estimable women, though less known to current visitors—to a brighter world; and Hannah, the sole survivor, was confined to her room; and the empty green-house, shorn of its honours, like poor Cowper's, told the mournful tale, that "man cometh up, and is cut down like a flower; he fleeth as it were a shadow, and never continueth in one stay." Hannah, with all her vivacity, which four-score years of pain could not repress, had this solemn truth ever prominent in her mind; yet she augured right, that she should survive her beloved sisters. "You always look with pleasure at these grounds," said she to the writer of these remarks, as he was one day walking with her among the laurels which she had planted; "I with pain, for I expect one day to be left alone in them."

We have penned these hasty reminiscences with a view to introduce the account given by Hannah More's biographer (or rather by his much-esteemed sister, the late Miss Roberts) of the last days of Sarah More; which will be read with the greater interest and edification in connexion with some previous knowledge of her character. Her patience and meek resignation under intense pain, and her deep-toned spirituality and ardent breathings after heaven, proved that the grace of God can mould every variety of the human soul into one likeness—the likeness of Christ. From the lips of Martha, whose fragile frame and long-continued sufferings seemed to keep her thoughts constantly within a short stage of her journey's end, we might perhaps have expected to hear such words of faith, hope, and charity—and we had almost said, of spiritual refinement—as characterised not only her last hours, but many years in which she "died daily;" but the death-bed of her sister might seem less likely to present such a fervent, yet chastened scene, as that portrayed in the following description, from which we will not longer detain our readers.

In the spring of 1817, by the death of Mrs. Sarah More, the eldest of the then surviving sisters, the family was again stricken. A companion was taken from them whose lively sallies of original wit* had often made sorrow smile, and forget itself. But it was the lot of this intelligent, virtuous, and entertaining person, to linger long in an extremity of suffering rarely surpassed. Her vivacity combatted long with her pains, but her victory over them was the reward of her patient hope in her Redeemer, her disclaimer of all self-righteous grounds of consolation, and her humble trust in the purchased pardon of her God. Her bed of death was the scene of awful edification—the voice of ecstacy mingling with the cry of anguish—the flesh dissolving in pain, and the spirit departing in peace. She had, indeed, an earthly stay in Hannah, who let none of the supports or pledges of Scripture testimony be wanting to her dying sister, while her's was the hand to do all that could be done by human help to mitigate the last crisis.

---

* We agree with Mr. Roberts as to the originality of her sallies; but we think the word *humour* more characteristic of them than *wit*. We should say that Hannah could be witty, and Martha playful, and Sally grotesque. Mr. Roberts has, however, H. More's own authority for his use of the word "humour" in the sense of wit; for in a letter written by her two months before Sarah's death, to her old friend Sir W. Pepys, the father of the present Lord Chancellor (of whom she relates some pleasing juvenile anecdotes), she says: "I really can say that age, as far as I can judge, has in no degree subdued the natural gaiety of my temper; and I hope it is no infringement on better things, that my taste for *humour*, and *a sort of sensible nonsense*, is no whit diminished." To the same effect she once said to us (or, dropping the technicality of editorialism, to the writer of this note), "I like *fun*; do not you?" Now, we can never admit that the word "humour," and much less "fun," justly described the brilliancy of her conversation. "Sensible nonsense" is a more apt description of some of her playful but sparkling effusions. One meets with such in her letters, as also in those of her attached friend, Mr. Wilberforce; but both of these eminent Christians kept a guard upon the door of their lips lest intellectual vivacity should degenerate into levity; and the "sort of nonsense" cease to be "sensible." It was very edifying to observe with what holy elasticity of feeling H. More would break off from some momentary epigrammatic archness, to the most solid and serious topics; still, indeed, speaking with her wonted pointedness of phrase, but not in order to amuse the fancy, but to express more clearly and strikingly the idea which she wished to convey. She never would allow that seriousness was dulness, or dulness seriousness.

"The Christian magnanimity by which the departure of this valuable person was distinguished, has been recorded by a tender friend, (the elder of the two Miss Roberts's, since taken from her sorrowing relatives), now the witness and partaker of her joy, who was constantly in her chamber during her last sickness. The following is her account:

"The last hours of our dear friend, Mrs. Sarah More, afforded so wonderful a manifestation of the mercy and faithfulness of God, and of the efficacy of the Holy Spirit's operation, that I have felt it a solemn duty to set down as many of the particulars (too many have escaped) as I can recollect; both for my own edification, and for the consolation of those friends who are more peculiarly interested in this display of the power and goodness of the Lord.

"From a very slight indication which appeared about six weeks before her departure, she was able to anticipate the whole progress and fatal termination of her disorder, which she explained to a confidential servant, with a composure, and acquiescence in the Divine will, truly admirable, and which never for a moment forsook her; adding at the same time, that not an hour of any day passed, in which she did not inwardly send up that supplication of the Litany, 'In the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, good Lord, deliver me.'

"It was a considerable time after the wound broke out in her leg, and began to wear a threatening appearance, before she permitted a groan or any strong expression of suffering to escape her; and when at length they were extorted by agony, she seemed to reproach herself for them, as implying a departure from that submission and acquiescence for which she daily and earnestly prayed. At one time when she was sitting in the parlour under very sharp suffering, one of her sisters exclaimed, 'Poor Sally, you are in dreadful pain.' She answered, 'I am indeed, but it is all well.' She still for some time longer continued to enjoy the society of her friends, who were often deceived, by the playfulness of her conversation, and the placidity of her manner, into the belief that the sad accounts which had been given of her situation were the exaggerations of affectionate alarm. While still so well as to be able in some degree to pursue her usual sedentary employments, she gave a striking proof how entirely she was withdrawing her mind from the things of this world, by refusing to have her chair placed near the bow window, from whence she could enjoy the sight of those plants and flowers which it had been her constant amusement and delight to cultivate, but from which she now turned with an expression of the completest indifference.

"At length it become impossible for her any longer to support a sitting position; and just before she was assisted up stairs for the last time, she threw a look all around her, evidently taking a mental farewell of the scene to which she had been so long accustomed, with an expression which, though she uttered no word, was full of solemn meaning. The extremity and constancy of her sufferings at length deprived her of the power of attending to a chain of reading which had hitherto been her chief delight and solace. To supply in some measure this loss, her sisters used to repeat from time to time, a few detached texts, in which she would constantly join with the greatest fervour. During the last two years of her life more especially, she had been so diligent and constant a reader of the Scriptures, as well as of other devotional books, that her mind had become completely imbued with them; and it was very remarkable, that in the moments of her sharpest pain, her attention was instantly excited, and her mind visibly comforted, if any by-stander recited a verse from the Scripture, or a short prayer, in which, even when unable to speak, she joined with deep fervour.

"One day when she had lain some time in an almost insensible state, a friend tried her with a few texts of Scripture; she suddenly burst forth, 'Can any thing be finer than that? it quite makes one's face shine!' Towards the latter part of her illness, she asked one day to have a little girl in whom she was interested brought to her. She could only deliver herself in short sentences, but her words were 'God bless thee, my dear child; love God, serve God; love to pray to God more than to do any other thing.' One night she complained of too much light, adding that 'the smallest light was enough to die by.' Mrs. H. More asked her 'if she had comfort in her mind.' 'Yes,' she replied, 'I have no *uncomfort* at all.' She was then asked if she knew some friend that was in the room? 'Oh! yes,' she answered, 'I know every body and remember every thing.' 'Ah, poor dear soul,' said one of her attendants, 'she remembers her sufferings too!' 'No,' she answered in a tone of the most affecting resignation, 'I do not think of them.' When she was supposed to be very near her last hour, on her medical attendant wishing her a good morning, she raised her hands in a holy transport,

exclaiming, 'Oh, for the glorious morning of the resurrection! but there are some grey clouds between!' She then blessed him with all his family, and exhorted him to love God, and to take care of his soul. 'Oh,' she exclaimed, 'if this should be the blessed hour of my deliverance, may I die the death of the righteous, and may my last thoughts be thoughts of faithfulness!' The following day she awoke suddenly out of a tranquil sleep, crying out in rapture, 'Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto the Lamb. Hallelujah!' Another morning, when she was imagined to be in the very act of dying, recovering herself a little, she murmured out, 'When shall I come to these things—grace—mercy—peace!' She then asked for a little cold water, and turning her head towards a nurse who was attending her, 'Do you know who it was that said, 'A cup of cold water given in my name?'

"Again, in the intervals between her wanderings and the extremity of pain, she exclaimed incessantly, 'Oh, the blood of Christ! he died for me. God was man! May his blood be shed on me!' 'Lord, let the light of thy countenance shine upon me.' 'When shall I appear before God?' And then half-bewildered again, she cried out earnestly to her sister, 'Patty, *do* love the blessed God? Lord, shield me with the wings of thy love.' After a little interval, she said to Mrs. H. More, 'I hope I have had all my stripes; Lord! I am ready, finish the work!' On awaking in the afternoon, she again poured forth this ejaculation, 'Lord, look down upon me with the light of thy salvation; let thy Holy Spirit shine upon me. Look, O Lord! upon thy afflicted servant.' Somebody present saying to her, 'The Lord will release you and take you out of your pain,' she seemed to fear, lest she had betrayed some impatience, and immediately answered, 'Aye, in his own good time.' She then broke out into the Gloria Patri, and added, 'Lord, look down upon a poor penitent, humble, contrite sinner.'

"Nearly three days now passed, either in strong delirium, or total stupor, at the end of which time she became more composed, and, as at every other time, uttered no sentence in which supplication or praise was not mingled. Her chief cry, on this day, was for pardon and sanctification, and she charged her sisters to strive for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Her wanderings were frequent, but whether sensible or incoherent, calm or agitated, still the names of her God and her Saviour were constantly on her tongue.

"Her sister asked her if she knew her; she answered, 'I know nobody but Christ.' In the evening of her last day but one, though scarcely able to articulate, she murmured out to those who stood round her, 'Talk of the cross—the precious cross—the King of love.' On the morning of her blessed and quiet release from an earthly existence, though no longer able to swallow food, or discern any earthly object, she was still enabled to give an evidence of the heavenly frame of her mind; a friend repeating to her, that heart-sustaining assurance, 'The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin,' she pronounced, with a devout motion of her hands and eyes, 'Cleanseth,' and a moment after, 'Blessed Jesus!' and these were the last of her words that could be collected. It is scarcely necessary to repeat, after such a relation, that her whole conduct during her conflict with this last enemy, was one uniform and uninterrupted display, (when she was in possession of her faculties,) of those fruits of the Spirit, enumerated by the Apostle, 'Love, peace, meekness, long-suffering, faith:' and it only remains for us to pray that our latter end may be like her's.'"

Mrs. H. More, writing to Mrs. Kennicott upon the occasion, says:

"This day se'nnight my dear sister Sarah exchanged this sorrowful sinful world, for a world, I humbly trust, of everlasting happiness. Four months we had watched over her increasing disease; for the last two it far exceeded in agony any thing I ever witnessed. Poor Patty and I closely attended this bed of suffering, but our distresses were mingled with much consolation. This sprightly, gay-tempered creature, whose vivacity age had not tamed, exhibited the most edifying spectacle I ever beheld. I cannot do justice to her humility, her patience, her submission. It was at times something almost *more* than resignation: it was a sort of spiritual triumph over the sufferings of her tormented body. She often said, 'I have never prayed for recovery, but for pardon. I do not fear death, but sin.' When she was *herself*, almost her whole time was spent in prayer, or, what was still more affecting, in praise. Miss Roberts, who kindly came to us in our affliction, wrote down a sheet full of her sayings, replete with faith and hope. Owing to the immense quantity of laudanum she took, she was frequently in a kind of delirium; but the habit of pious thought was so confirmed, that even in that state she was always repeating broken portions of Psalms. She was earnestly desirous to depart and to be with Christ. For above a month, her leg was in a

complete state of mortification. We were frequently roused in the night by her piercing groans, which she vainly endeavoured to restrain, fearing they would offend God. Our prayers for a gentle dissolution were granted: she expired in great tranquillity. May her example sink deep in the hearts of all who witnessed it. She commonly sent away her surgeon in tears. Patty and I have seen none of our friends since her death, though they constantly call at the door. I hope we shall now be able to get a little air, having been confined to the house since the middle of September last. Patty is in a weak declining state. I am better than in the winter. Pray for me that I may be enabled to *do* and to *suffer* the whole will of God. My three departed sisters have quitted the world in the same order of succession in which they entered it. My turn *in course* would be next. But all is in the hands of infinite wisdom and mercy."

ON IMPASSIONED FAMILIARITY OF ADDRESS IN HYMNS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I WAS reminded, by the remarks of a correspondent in your last Number upon a popular hymn, of a few thoughts which I some time ago intended to submit to the notice of your readers, upon a character of phraseology of a very different kind, which is much in vogue among the mystics in the Roman Catholic Church, but which is not consistent with the hallowed reverence that ought ever to be observed in invoking our Divine Lord, the second Person in the holy and undivided Trinity. I allude to that impassioned familiarity of address which you have yourself mentioned as occurring in such lines as the following, by Bishop Ken, as quoted in your last volume, page 654.

Jesu, since thy love my soul allured,
I have an amorous martyrdom endured;
These fleshly clogs me from my Jesus part, &c.

Thirsting for Jesus.

I thirst, I thirst: Oh cool me for I burn;
My very bones will into cinders turn.
While to be from Thee, Jesu, &c.

Upon these verses you observed:—

"We have cited these few lines, and we might cite hundreds of others in the same strain, not for the purpose of saying that this impassioned style of Divine poesy is faultless, and much less for the contrary purpose of carping at the fervours of this holy man—whose faith and love, whose zeal and humility, whose tenacious clinging to the cross of his Redeemer, and whose seraphic flights heaven-ward to behold Him, inspire in us reverence and devout emulation—but for the sake of noticing the remark of Mr. Bowles, that these 'nauseous' and 'insane' 'rhapsodies' are 'Puritan.' Mr. Bowles should have remembered how decidedly Ken had disclaimed Puritanism in his last Will. . . . . The style which Mr. Bowles calls 'Puritan,' was engendered in the mystic school of the Church of Rome. Ken resembled in character his Gallican contemporary, Fenelon; and Fenelon was the spiritual pupil of Madame Guion; and we cannot but think that Ken was familiar with her verses. But if he did not know Madame Guion, he well knew those Latin hymn-writers whose compositions introduced this strain; and we know not why that should be the tenderness of devotion in the Popish Breviary, which in Protestant English is 'nauseous and insane rhapsody.'"

If I understand rightly these remarks, you do not mean to approve of this style of composition, though you did not wish to be hard upon such a writer as Ken, who uses it in the reverent affection of his soul for his Redeemer; your immediate object being to show that the style, whether faulty or otherwise, is characteristic of the mystical school, rather than the Puritanal, to which Mr. Bowles had referred it. Of this there can be no question; or if there be, let the ques-

tionist compare some of the hymns in the Breviary, or some of the expressions in such works as "The Sacred Heart of Jesus," with the doctrinal style of the Calvinistic writers, whose very hymns are often theological dissertations in verse, rather than impassioned effusions of the soul. Mrs. Rowe fashioned herself upon Madame Guion more than upon the Assembly's catechism; and the Wesleys, whom I have often heard censured in this matter with more severity than was deserved, were assuredly not pupils of the Puritan school, though they had studied with much fervour some devout writers who inclined to the doctrines of mysticism, from the days of Kempis to those of the Jansenists. There is a beautiful hymn of Charles Wesley's beginning,

> "Jesu, lover of my soul,
> Let me to thy bosom fly;"

which I have seen altered in at least twenty modern collections; sometimes Jesu being changed into Jesus; sometimes Lover into Refuge or Saviour; and sometimes "Let me to thy bosom fly" into "To thy sheltering arms I fly." These alterations, by so many hands, show that the phraseology has been considered by the correctors open to the charge of what Mr. Bowles calls the "Puritan" fault of "introducing human passions"—or at least, words connected with them—"into religion." Now I have a very strong impression that these very lines are a translation from a Latin hymn; and the use of the Latin vocative "Jesu," which this stanza has rendered familiar to English hymn-writers and readers, though in the time of the Wesleys it was not so, confirms that impression. I suppose that Professor Keble will not be considered puritanically inclined; and yet there are some expressions in his beautiful and hallowed "Christian Year," which, if used by Watts or Doddridge, would probably have been blamed as too impassioned. I do not feel disposed to search for specimens, and the exquisite taste of Mr. Keble prevents even ardent language from being offensive; but I open almost casually at the hymn for the first Sunday after Christmas, and there I find an address to the Almighty, as the "Father and Lover of our souls;" and in the next stanza I read,

> "Thou smil'st on us in wrath, and we
> Even in remorse *would smile on Thee*;"

and our tears are said to "glow with the light *accepted love* imparts;" and two stanzas after I meet with the invocation—

> "O Thou who keep'st *the key of love*,
> . . . . . overflow this heart of mine."

Now, Sir, as between the sublime and the ridiculous there is but one step; so there are not many between this language of "accepted love," which it requires all the delicacy, devoutness, and unction of a Keble to keep within due bounds when described in the ardent breathings of poesy, and the exceptionable style to which I have adverted, and which is so common among some of the monastic writers.

My object in the present remarks is to warn the members of the Church of England against whatever entrenches upon that severe gravity and reverential awe which so peculiarly characterize her services. I do not mean that there are not in them the most fervent expressions of love and gratitude to our Divine Lord; but there is a most marked abstinence from those familiarities of phrase which occur in many Popish writers. Hitherto there has been in our church

no danger from this source; for so it was, that during the last century and a half, the majority of our divines have, like Mr. Bowles, had the ready but oft misapplied by-word of Puritanism, or the more modern one of Methodism, to repress whatever they considered over-warm in feeling or expression in matters of religion; and horrified, indeed, would they have been, if in some Tabernacle Hymn-book they had seen God addressed as "Lover of our souls," who "keeps the key of love;" and had read that "we smile on Him," while "glowing with the light accepted love imparts." But when this language comes to us through the mystical, not the puritanical school, and with poetical attraction instead of revolting coarseness, there is some danger lest the old solemn reverential style of prayer, and praise, and psalmody, should begin to assume a sentimental air, and dreamy imaginativeness take the place of Scriptural solidity. I write not as a harsh censor in these matters; I am not myself revolted when I read in some seraphic divine such a phrase as "Dear Jesu;"* or find in Mr. Keble's poems impassioned words and thoughts so etherially shaded, that they present a lovely bloom, which, if rubbed off by coarser handling, would exhibit offensive crudeness; but there is apt to be a sort of fashion in these things; and I offer the present warning because I have witnessed symptoms of imitation on the part of some who were not guided by the same chastened taste or devout feeling. If the language of certain Romish books of devotion is to be emulated, we shall have, instead of the reverence of those who tread on holy ground, a sort of parodies on Mrs. Rowe, who, in some of her most painful (though in her case unaffectedly ardent) expressions, the genuine outpourings of her rapt spirit, but used the language of celebrated Romanist nuns and saints. I could mention instances in which the infant Saviour is addressed in Christmas effusions in words almost of maternal or sisterly *fondness;* and He who is "God over all, blessed for evermore," is "clasped" with earthly caresses. The awful scene of the crucifixion is in like manner debased by ill-assorted associations. But examples are not necessary; I only hold out a general warning; adding to it this maxim, that upon such solemn topics we should not say in verse what we would not say in prose; nor with our pen what we would not with our lips; nor in a book what we would not in a pulpit. We live in a cold age; but false fire will not warm it.

OLD SCHOOL.

* Such epithets as "dear" and "fond" used to be sternly denounced by most Oxford divines as improper in devotional compositions; but they frequently occur in those of the present Oxford professor of poetry. Thus we read, in the very first piece in the Christian Year, of "Thy dear love;" and, again of Christ being the Son of God's "dear love;" and of "Thy dear sake;" and also of "Thy dear praise," applied to the Holy Trinity, on Trinity Sunday, in which sense the epithet is theologically exceptionable; for though we may say "My Saviour," or "Dear Jesu," we cannot rightly say "My Trinity," or "Dear God," or "Thy dear praise." I doubt also whether it is not too familiar for Mr. Keble to call the Sacramental wine, "Blood, out of a dear Friend's side;" nor do the Evangelists speak of "the plumes of Jesu's Dove;" or "the meek brow of Jesus;" though he was, indeed, "meek and lowly." I ought, however, in justice to Mr. Keble, to add his own defence of this kind of language. He says:

"Love on the Saviour's dying head
Her spikenard drops unblamed may pour;
May mount the cross, and wrap him, dead,
In spices from the golden shore;
Risen, may embalm his Sacred name,
With all a painter's art, and all a minstrel's flame."

Surely "a minstrel's flame" is fitter for earthly loves than for sacred worship. Such allusions carry away the mind from heavenly to terrestrial allusions.

*** The subject of injudicious phraseology in hymns has been occasionally noticed in our pages; though we are not aware that the evil is particularly glaring at the present moment. The sort of language alluded to by Old School was strongly animadverted upon by our old correspondent Bishop Heber, in our volume for 1811, in communicating to our pages the first portion of those admirable hymns which have since attained such deserved celebrity. As that volume is not in the hands of a large portion of our present readers, we will transcribe his remarks. The signature D. R. was perhaps intended for the final letters of Reginald Heber.

"*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

"The following hymns are part of an intended series, appropriated to the Sundays and principle holidays of the year; connected in some degree with their particular Collects and Gospels, and designed to be sung between the Nicene Creed and the Sermon. The effect of an arrangement of this kind, though only partially adopted, is very striking in the Romish Liturgy; and its place should seem to be very imperfectly supplied by a few verses of a Psalm, entirely unconnected with the peculiar devotions of the day, and selected at the discretion of a clerk or organist. On the merits of the present imperfect essays, the author is unaffectedly diffident; and as his labours are intended for the use of his own congregation, he will be thankful for any suggestion which may advance or correct them. In one respect at least, he hopes that the following poems will not be found reprehensible; no fulsome or indecorous language has been knowingly adopted: no erotic addresses to Him whom no unclean lip can approach; no allegory ill understood and worse applied. It is not enough, in his opinion, to object to such expressions that they are fanatical: they are positively profane. When our Saviour was on earth, and in great humility conversant with mankind; when he sat at the tables, and washed the feet, and healed the diseases of his creatures; yet did not his disciples give him any more familiar name than Master or Lord. And now at the right hand of his Father's majesty, shall we address him with ditties of embraces and passion, or language which it would be disgraceful in an earthly sovereign to endure? Such expressions, it is said, are taken from Scripture: but even if the original application, which is often doubtful, were clearly and unequivocally ascertained, yet though the collective Christian church may very properly be personified as the spouse of Christ, an application of such language to individual believers is as dangerous as it is absurd and unauthorized. Nor is it going too far to assert, that the brutalities of a common swearer can hardly bring religion into more sure contempt, or more scandalously profane the name which is above every name in heaven and earth, than certain epithets applied to Christ in our popular collections of religious poetry. D. R."

There was somewhat of exaggeration in these remarks; but their substance is important. Heber was well acquainted with the amatory language of the Romanist school, and justly denounced it. His rule is a good one, not to address to our Saviour in heaven language more familiar than the sacred writers addressed to him. It cannot be too ardent; it may even be ecstatic; but it must be reverent, and not fond, or familiar, or dreamy, or sentimental.

DR. VAUGHAN AND THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SINCE reading your remarks on a passage from a work of Dr. Vaughan's (see your April Number, page 249, &c.), entitled "The Causes of the Corruption of Christianity," I have met with the subjoined quotation, from another work of the same divine, namely, "Thoughts on the past and present State of Religious Parties in England;" which, as it displays Dr. Vaughan's opinion (and probably that of many of the Evangelical Dissenters) respecting the lawfulness

and expediency of the Established Church, I think in candour and justice towards that gentleman, you ought to give it a place in your publication, seeing you have commented so freely on the former passage of his writings. His words are these:

"The great charge against us, so far as I am able to ascertain, is, that we are aiming at nothing less than the destruction of the Established Church. Now, it is not denied that the principles of Congregationalism are opposed to the existence of any civil establishment of Christianity. But it is one thing to be persuaded that a nation might have chosen a wiser course than it has done, and another to fall into a justly censurable mode of proceeding, in order to correct a prevalent error. It may be strictly lawful that there should be no Established Church, but in the state of society existing in England it may be far from expedient. The whole question, though truly one of principle, is also one to be determined, in a great degree, by circumstances. While the social system of England shall be what it is, and while the prevalent feeling in favour of an Established Church shall be what it is, there ought, as I conceive, to be such a Church. The Dissenter may say that the State, in this respect, is exercising a power which it ought not to have assumed; but so long as the State is not so persuaded, it should not be expected to relinquish the policy which has naturally resulted from a different consciousness of duty. Principle, on this great question, may be of as much moment to the Churchman as to the Dissenter. And if there are Dissenters who, having looked to the Monarchy and to the Court of England, and to the prepossessions, on this subject, of the persons who constitute the upper and even the lower House of Parliament, and have expected to see these parties concur in any thing approaching towards an extinction of the State Church, such expectation must surely have been indulged in some of those delusive moments when the passions do not allow the understanding to perform its proper office." p. xviii.

A CONSTANT READER.

*** We do not see that our having "commented freely" upon Dr. Vaughan's allegations against the Church of England, not in reference to its being an Established Church, but to matters which would be the same whether it were established or not, makes it incumbent upon us "in candour and justice" to insert his opinions as to the general question whether an Established Church ought to be tolerated. But there was no occasion to appeal to our "candour and justice;" for we have great pleasure in giving publicity to Dr. Vaughan's truly candid, enlightened, and Christian remarks on this subject, which ought to be seriously weighed by all his agitating brethren. Our only surprise is, that, professing such sentiments, he can make himself responsible as a director of the Eclectic Review for such opinions as we noticed in our Number for last January. We will quote that portion of our observations in which the name of Dr. Vaughan was mentioned, and shall be happy if "A Constant Reader" can shew us how to reconcile his corporate advice in his Eclectic capacity with his personal advice above cited. We wrote:

"The radicals and revolutionists of some parishes, taking the law into their own hands, have decided, not only that church-rates are a grievance which ought to be legally abolished, but that they shall be put an end to by terrorism; just as the lawless banditti of Ireland have prevented the legal payment of tithes; and we owe it, under the merciful providence of God, to the good sense and peaceable feelings of the populace, that the anti-church-rate conspiracy has not in many places led to scenes of confusion and bloodshed; for who could answer for what might be the conduct of an exasperated multitude collected to oppose the levying of a tax, or the sale of goods to defray it, if they could be persuaded by inflammatory harangues that it was unjust, and ought to be resisted with force of arms? While we are writing, a Mr. Murphy and others, in the metropolitan parish of St. Pancras, have been found guilty, by a jury of their countrymen, of the serious crime of forming a conspiracy to obstruct the officers of justice in the legal discharge of their duty in the collection of church-rates. Such is the practical comment; now let us look at the text. Suppose we turn to an anti-church-rate speech of Mr. Hinton, a well known and influential Evangelical Dissenting minister. 'I tell (her Majesty's) ministers,' he says, 'that if

they will not abolish the rate, we will be as unquiet as the Irish'—[cheers]. 'I have no pretensions to be like Mr. O'Connell in any other matter'—how modest! and how indicative of the admiration of Mr. Hinton and his friends for that great man!—'but I have no objection to resemble him in this, to stand on the platform and cry to the people of England, Agitate! Agitate!' Mr. Murphy of St. Pancras gave precisely the same advice. Mr. Hinton adds, 'If that rate is not abolished in parliament in three years, *it will be abolished out of it*'—an expression which can only be construed to mean *by illegal violence*. If, then, we were to say that Mr. Hinton and Mr. Murphy fraternized in their views of this matter, we do not think our expression would be much too strong. Or if from Mr. Hinton, an individual, we turn to the Eclectic Review—the editor of which mentions among his coadjutors Dr. P. Smith himself, with Mr. Binney and Dr. Vaughan,—we find it urged upon every 'conscientious Dissenter' never again to pay church-rates; but to oppose the law of the land after the manner which in Ireland they call 'passive resistance;' which was precisely the advice given by the infidels and radicals in St. Pancras: 'Let your goods be seized;' and then when they were to be sold, Mr. Murphy made a speech urging the populace 'to pile up heaps of bones' before the doors of those who received goods for rates, and to point them out as they walk the streets. Mr. Murphy did not, we believe, say what by-word was to be used on the occasion, but the Eclectic Reviewers will aid his vocabulary. Those who will not join the conspiracy of passive resistance against the law of the land, are to be taunted as men 'who are ready to surrender their allegiance to Christ'—who 'would not hesitate to pay a tax for supporting the false prophet in a Turkish mosque, or withhold their contributions, when legally demanded, for the temple of Juggernaut,'—who are supporting a system 'as deteriorating to the character of Christianity, and as subversive of its influence, *as any form of paganism under the sun*;' 'as unlike Christianity' as 'the heathenism of Pekin,'—and whose clergy 'are little better than idolaters' (!!) These, says the Eclectic, are '*the views of Dissenters generally*,' or at least of 'very many of all denominations.'"

Let our correspondent, after reading this statement, decide whether we are not justified in saying that too many of the Evangelical Dissenters are fraternizing with Socinians, infidels, and Papists, to subvert the National Church Establishments of these realms. Is it our invention that these are the doctrines of Dissenting magazines and newspapers? Have we misquoted the Eclectic? Do not Dr. Smith, Dr. Vaughan, and other of the most influential "Evangelical Dissenters," give their names as a guarantee for the opinions and recommendations set forth in that work? Have they denied the statement officially issued under their own authority, that the atrocious doctrines above quoted "are the views of Dissenters generally;" or at least of "very many of all denominations?" Has Dr. Vaughan disclaimed his partnership in a publication which avows such anti-Christian, inflammatory, and anti-English opinions? Did not the Evangelical Dissenters fraternize with Mr. O'Connell at the anti-Church-Rate meeting, and cheer him when he called Dr. Chalmers a blasphemer? just as their monthly organ says that the clergy of the Church of England "are little better than idolaters," and that they uphold a system "as deteriorating to the character of Christianity, and as subversive of its influence, as any form of Paganism under the sun." Which of the teachers of the Dissenting body have come forward to repugn such sentiments? We are told that it is unfair to expect they should do so; that in order to accomplish any great object, men must ostensibly "go with their party," though they do not approve of all that is done by the majority; that those who object to National Church establishments, must not be nice as to the motives, the words, or conduct of those who abet their object, in however unjustifiable a spirit; and that Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Smith, Mr. Binney, and their friends, must use all their efforts to uphold such publications as labour in the common cause—especially their Coryphæus, the Eclectic Review—though there may be some shades of opinion as to whether the Church of England is really as bad as "a Turkish mosque" or "the temple of Juggernaut;" and as

to whether Christians are warranted in entering into conspiracies to avoid paying tribute.

We have but one word to say to all this, which is, that a Christian must afford to keep a conscience. If Dr. Vaughan will disclaim the doctrines which pass under his name as an Eclectic co-operator, we will gladly insert his disclaimer. If the passage which our correspondent has sent us speaks his present sentiments, why does he not, and why do not those of his brethren who think with him, "come out and be separate" from men who make their savour to be abhorred? If the respectable Dissenters would not ruin their own cause, their duty and their policy is to dissever themselves, publicly and completely, from agitating demagogues. Many devout and influential laymen among them are quitting their ranks in disgust. They thought them pious, peaceable, and heavenly-minded; they find them worldly and ambitious; and they are anxious to escape to some communion in which they may be allowed to "work out their salvation" without being obliged to meddle with political squabbles. A small nucleus of the best class of Dissenters—men who fear God and are quiet in the land—might soon gather around them a moral strength which they can never acquire by secular agitation. They lose in public feeling, by lack of spiritual-mindedness, far more than they gain by a few radical, infidel, or popish votes in parliament. As a body they are in a false position; as individuals they are injuring their peace and endangering their souls; and in every way they are causing an irreparable breach between themselves and the great mass of the wealth, talent, rank, and sound principle of the country; and they are especially alienating the regards of the religious portion of the community, who almost forgot their dissent in those moral and religious claims to affection and respect which they inherited from their pious forefathers.

We have confined our remarks on Dr. Vaughan to his share of responsibility for the offensive passages in the Eclectic; but did our correspondent never hear of the publications of the Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society, which are even more bitter and mendacious than the pages of the Eclectic? And is our correspondent aware that this Society was formed by the leading Evangelical Dissenters, who appointed Dr. Cox, Dr. Bennett, and Dr. Vaughan their secretaries? and we are not aware that Dr. Vaughan has relinquished that office; or that if he has, he has assigned as his reason that he cannot countenance "bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking." We wish that Dr. Burnett or Mr. Hinton would publish a sermon to shew how the putting away "clamour" is to be reconciled with their favourite O'Connell maxim of "Agitate, agitate, agitate!" which we suppose means "Clamour, clamour, clamour." If, says Mr. Hinton, the cabinet will not abolish the church-rate, "we (Evangelical ministers) will be as unquiet (that is as clamerous) as the Irish." What a comment upon the inspired injunction, "Study to be quiet!"

ARCHBISHOP LAURENCE AND BISHOP HEBER ON REGENERATION BEFORE BAPTISM; WITH A WORD ON BISHOP BRADFORD, MR. SCOTT, AND MR. BIDDULPH

For the Christian Observer.

WE mentioned in our last Number the Archbishop of Cashel's republication of his work on baptism; which was, for the most part, a reply to the Rev. J. Scott's "Inquiry into the Effects of Baptism ac-

cording to the Sense of Holy Scripture and the Church of England, in Answer to the Rev. Dr. Mant's two Tracts on Regeneration and Conversion, circulated with the last Annual Packet of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." The controversy caused by Dr. Mant's tracts lasted for several years, and was reviewed at great length in our volumes. The present Bishop of Bangor and Mr. Biddulph have also lately republished the works issued by them on that occasion*.

* Mr. Scott's work was published in 1815; Dr. (now Archbishop) Laurence's reply to it, next year. We do not recollect that Mr. Scott printed a rejoinder as a separate pamphlet, but he inserted one with his name in our vol. for 1816, p. 619, in which he complained, as we did last month, of his learned antagonist's having blended the question of the effects of baptism with the question of predestination, whereas many strong predestinarians have held the Archbishop's views on baptism; and many who hold very different views—as, for instance, the Wesleyan Methodists,—are well-known anti-predestinarians. Mr. Scott remarked,—"The cry of Calvinism resounds throughout Dr. Laurence's book from one end to the other. The whole question is made by him a Calvinistic one; and every person who does not adopt Dr. Laurence's views of baptismal regeneration must bear all the odium with which the doctor can load him as the upholder of the obnoxious doctrines of absolute predestination and indefectible grace. Archdeacon Daubeny knows better; and he is above resorting to what I cannot help calling such unworthy artifices. Though sufficiently jealous of Calvinism, he knows, and he has the candour to avow it, that many who are no Calvinists take our side in the question concerning baptism and regeneration; and though very suspicious of the leaning of some passages in my Inquiry, he does not pretend that I have introduced any thing that can be challenged as decided Calvinism." After such disclaimers, and considering the notoriety of the fact, we are much concerned that his Grace should judge it right and necessary, now that two-and-twenty years have elapsed, and in his present influential station, to republish this very serious mistatement, or we would rather say mistake; for we repeat, that we will not allow ourselves to use the word "misrepresentation," which his Grace so freely charges upon those whom he calls "a party which appropriates to itself the epithet evangelical." We lament, however, to learn that his Grace's republication of this work, in his present high official character as Archbishop of Cashel, has added another to the many sources of agitation which afflict the Church of Ireland; as indeed could not be otherwise, seeing that the remarkable revival of piety and diligence among the clergy of that Church, which amidst all the desolations of our distracted sister-island affords a bright beam of hope, has been notoriously and avowedly connected with the exhibition of those very doctrines which his Grace calls the misrepresentation of a party. Ireland is over-run with what his Grace denounces as "Calvinism;" but much that he so denounces is no more Calvinism than it is Soofeism or Budhism; but is the pure doctrine of Scripture and of the Protestant Reformation. But be it what it may, it is the basis of that blessed extension of piety and zeal which has succeeded to the cold somnolency and secularity which so long weighed down the Irish Church, and delivered it over an easy prey to the Romish priesthood; and the direful fruits of which are now being reaped in the calamities which afflict it. Had all the parishes in Ireland been supplied during the last century with ministers of the character of those whom the Archbishop means to describe when he speaks of "a party," who "prefer the denomination of the Evangelical clergy to that of the Calvinistical clergy," we feel satisfied that the relative position of Papists and Protestants would not be what it is at present; nor can we doubt that it would have pleased God so to bless the faithful preaching of his word and the zealous labours of his servants, that, long before this, Popery might have received its death's blow in Ireland. As little do we doubt that it is to the character and exertions of these "misrepresenters" (as Dr. Laurence accounts them) of the United Church of England and Ireland, that we are chiefly indebted for the firm hold which our sister communion retains at this moment upon the affections of the country; for if the Irish clergy had been, as a body, during the last five years, what they were half a century ago, in the good days when there were few or none of these so-called Calvinistic or Evangelical misrepresenters, the Church of Ireland would not have been thought

We are not about to re-open the general question; but happening to have the Archbishop of Cashel's book lying side by side with Bishop Heber's three volumes of parochial sermons lately published, we offer a single specimen of collation, which is worth notice. The Archbishop of Cashel has the following heading in his table of contents: "Opinion that regeneration exists before and without baptism, controverted." His Grace does not merely argue that regeneration may take place at baptism, which no person denies; but that it cannot possibly, under any circumstances, take place before or after. He quotes Mr. Scott as saying, that in the case of persons who "are partakers of repentance and faith (and consequently possess the grace of God) before they are baptized," "regeneration, strictly taken in the sense of the infusion of a new principle of life and action, or as Hooker's words are, 'the first disposition towards future newness of life,' cannot be received by those persons in baptism, for they already have it before they are baptized. All that they need is to have these spiritual graces confirmed and increased, which they may confidently expect in this sacrament by virtue of prayer unto God." This statement the Archbishop controverts, contending that regeneration is "the effect" of baptism; which is tantamount to affirming that baptism is *the cause* of regeneration; for effect and cause correspond. But upon turning to Bishop Heber's sermon for Whit-Sunday, we find him saying, in exact accordance with Mr. Scott, that in the case of Cornelius and his family, God was pleased to shed forth his Spirit "before water had yet been brought; thereby to prove by an unanswerable argument, that the outward token of regeneration by water was not to be denied to those whom God himself had regenerated by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and of fire." Bishop Heber here very properly uses the phrase "outward token" not "cause;" for to make baptism and regeneration cause and effect is going very far indeed towards the opus operatum doctrine of the church of Rome.

Now if in the case of Cornelius God did regenerate by his Holy Spirit one, who though penitent and believing, was not yet baptized, the doctrine that the inward spiritual grace can never exist without the outward visible sign, is refuted; for if there could be one exception there might be many. We accordingly turned back to Dr. Laurence to see how he accounted for this case of Cornelius, but to our great disappointment we met with the following declaration as the rule by which his Grace conducts the whole discussion:

---

worthy of being contended for, and Popery would have had an easy triumph. But even if matters were otherwise, we should still be of opinion that it is not discreet for an Irish Archbishop to raise a strife in the bosom of the Irish Church by denouncing a large portion of his clergy as men who, "for reasons best known to themselves," are trifling with God and conscience by such disingenuous and cowardly conduct as he imputes to them. If offences must come, they arise not from those who meekly stand on their defence under false accusation, but upon the assailants. It is with pain that we ever allude, except in the way of concurrence and gratitude, to any thing which emanates from an episcopal pen; but if a prelate in the highest station in the Church puts forth such mistakes respecting a large portion of his brethren as we have above noticed, it implies no want of reverence for his holy office or fatherly authority that we submissively state that he has not rightly conceived the matter. We appeal from Dr. Laurence as at present advised, to Dr. Laurence better informed of what Calvinism really is.

"I do not propose, unnecessarily, as it appears to me, to drag Scripture into the contest; for *the true question at issue is, not what Scripture*, but *what the Church of England*, has inculcated upon the subject. Besides, to commence with ascertaining the precise sense of Scripture upon it, is to commence with a bias upon the mind, which must unavoidably influence subsequent investigation."

Now though his Grace does not mean, that if he had "dragged" in Scripture the "bias" would be contrary to his views of what is Anglican doctrine, yet his refraining from doing so renders us unable to ascertain how he would refute the statement of Bishop Heber. Mr. Biddulph, who takes the same view of the case of Cornelius as Bishop Heber, says, in regard to the whole question: "we will *first* make our appeal to the New Testament;* and it is only after this primary inquiry that he proceeds to inquire, "What is the doctrine of our own venerable church on the subject." It is true, as Dr. Laurence says, that we cannot know whether the doctrines of our church tally with Scripture till we have ascertained what those doctrines are; but it is not an ordinary course of proceeding to begin with the comment, and then to call in the text; instead of beginning with the text, and then seeing whether the comment upon it is correct. Besides, if that which we read first leaves a "bias" upon the mind, and "must unavoidably influence subsequent investigation," it is better that our bias should come from the word of God than from the word of man; and that we should allow Scripture to influence us in our investigation of the services of the Church, rather than the services of the Church to influence us in our appeal to Scripture. We altogether deny that "the true question at issue is, not what Scripture, but what the Church of England has inculcated." The first question is, What has Scripture inculcated; the second is, Does the Church of England, or Rome, or any other communion into whose doctrines we are inquiring, inculcate the same? If it clearly does, all is well; and even if its language be not perfectly clear, but still can be honestly reconciled with Scripture, we may lawfully take it in this right sense; but if it contradict Scripture there is no alternative but to reject it. Mr. Scott considered that Scripture attaches but one meaning to the expression, "being born again;" and he thought that our Church, in the case of an adult, connects this privilege with actual faith, and in the case of an infant with the vow made by the sureties, upon the charitable supposition that when he comes to age he will take it upon himself. Mr. Biddulph preferred the doctrine which had been long taught by the Christian Knowledge Society in Bishop Bradford's tract, till that tract was expelled in favour of Dr. Mant's. This doctrine was, that there is a spiritual and a baptismal regeneration; corresponding to a change of nature and a change of state. Bishop Bradford's tract having been restored to the Society's list in consequence of the controversy which took place, our readers may consult it for themselves; but the following passage from Mr. Biddulph will shew the nature of the distinction adverted to. We will only premise that for ourselves we could never feel satisfied with this *via media*. The great body of those who *deny* that regeneration can take place only in baptism, mean by regeneration a spiritual birth; they maintain that the term has no other signification in the word of God; and the great body of those who *assert* that regeneration can take place only in baptism, maintain the same. In this, Dr. Laurence and Mr. Scott, the Oxford Tract writers and most of their opponents, are agreed; and

the only question under this head is respecting the language of the baptismal service; some declaring it to be as absolute in the case of an infant, as of a believing adult; while others think that the Church, in the catechism and elsewhere, teaches differently. Still we know that the Via Media has been trodden, with firm step, by many pious, learned, and judicious men; and the following may serve as a finger-post to it.

"I concur in the explanation which is given by Bishop Bradford, in his sermon on 'Baptismal and spiritual regeneration,' which is on the list of 'the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,' as containing the sentiments of that venerable body on this controverted subject; that the baptismal services speak only of a relative change, as distinct from a proper spiritual regeneration. The copy now before me is one of the seventh edition, printed in 1810. The following note is prefixed to it by the Society:—'This seventh edition is published at a time when it is hoped that so judicious and scriptural a discourse may be of service to settle the minds of good Christians in some present disputes concerning baptismal and scriptural regeneration.'

"I shall not recite very extensive extracts from the Bishop's sermon; but I hope that you will carefully read it at your leisure. The method which he adopts in handling his text, viz. Titus iii. 4—7, is, '1. To show why baptism is styled the washing of regeneration. 2. To inquire how it becomes a means whereby we are saved. 3. To shew what the renewing of the Holy Ghost is, which St. Paul joins with the washing of regeneration. 4. To shew that the washing of regeneration may be separated from the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and that, if it be, the end for which it is used cannot be obtained, the latter being absolutely necessary in order to our being saved, in the complete sense of that word. 5. To inquire how those persons who have had the washing of regeneration, but are not yet renewed by the Divine Spirit, may attain that renovation.'

"This is the plan of the Bishop's sermon. And under his second division, after stating that baptism is a sign and a means of grace, he adds, 'And hence we may learn by the way clearly to understand those expressions in our office of baptism, which some have objected against, for want of considering the true import of them. Those who are regularly baptized are born again, or regenerated into a new state, entered upon new relations, obliged to live new lives; they are admitted into that body of which Jesus Christ is the head, and in which the Holy Spirit dwelleth, in order to quicken and sanctify, to direct and influence, all its members, which do not resist and refuse his conduct. This is baptismal regeneration.' Afterwards, under his next division, the Bishop proceeds to distinguish between this baptismal regeneration and spiritual regeneration, as called in his text the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

"In his fourth division, in which he shews that the washing of regeneration, or baptism, may be separated from the renewing of the Holy Ghost, or spiritual regeneration, he says, (I quote the passage because it sheds light on the language adopted by our church), 'It is the way of the Scriptures to speak to and of the visible members of the church of Christ under such appellations and expressions as may seem at first hearing to imply that they are all truly righteous or holy persons. Thus the Apostles style those to whom they write in general, saints; speak of them as sanctified in Christ Jesus, chosen of God, buried with Christ in baptism, risen again with him from the dead, sitting with him in heavenly places: and particularly St. Paul says, They were saved by the washing of regeneration, &c. The reason of which is, that they were visibly, by obligation and profession, all this; which was thus represented to them, the more effectually to stir them up and engage them to live according to their profession and obligation. But yet it is too evident from divers passages in their writings, and experience has confirmed to us the same thing, that, both in their times and ever since, there have been many who have enjoyed the washing of regeneration, whose tempers and manners have demonstrated that they were not renewed by the Holy Ghost. Simon Magus was a notorious instance to this purpose, who, though the text tells us that he believed, yet was soon after told by St. Peter, that he had neither part nor lot in this matter (namely, the gift of the Holy Ghost), forasmuch as his heart was not right in the sight of God; and that he perceived he was in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity, Acts viii. 13, 21, 23. I take it for granted, that I need not insist on any proof of this matter; but only further observe, that baptismal regeneration, when separated from the renewing of the

Holy Ghost, must necessarily be ineffectual to the salvation of men's souls. St. Paul, in my text (Titus iii. 4—7), joins them together, as concurring in the work of our salvation; and our Saviour, in the place before cited, makes the being born of the Spirit, as well as of water, necessary to the entering into the kingdom of God. St. Peter, in like manner, when he mentions baptism, as saving us, adds, to prevent all mistake, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh (not that merely), but the answer of a good conscience towards God; 1 Peter iii. 21. That also is necessary to salvation; namely, when the baptized person's heart, and consequently his life, agree with his profession and obligation. What St. Paul says of the Jews, may be repeated with respect to Christians also, with a little variation of the words; He is not a Christian who is one outwardly, neither is that regeneration (namely, such as will be effectual to salvation) which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Christian who is one inwardly, and regeneration is that of the heart, in the Spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God, Rom. ii. 28, 29. Many of those who were not only baptized in the name of Christ, but also received many excellent gifts from him, and by virtue thereof prophesied, and had done many wonderful works, yet will be rejected by him at the last day, for having been workers of iniquity,' Matt. vii. 22, 23.

"Such were the sentiments of Bishop Bradford; and such also, for a period during which many Editions of the Bishop's sermons have been printed and sold, have been the sentiments of the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, who have characterized this sermon in the edition printed in 1810, as judicious and scriptural, and have recommended it for settling the mind on the subject of baptismal and spiritual regeneration. Such was the explanation given by Bishop Bradford, and adopted by them, of the expressions used in our baptismal service, that they refer to a baptismal regeneration not necessarily connected with spiritual regeneration. In these sentiments, and in this explanation of the Bishop, I concur; and if I therein err, I err in the company of Bishop Bradford, and in that of the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

"Bishop Burnet's language on the subject is to the same effect with that of Bishop Bradford. He observes that 'It is a very natural distinction to say, that the outward effects of Baptism follow it, as outwardly performed; but that the inward effects follow upon the inward acts.'"

It struck us, we well remember, at the time, as somewhat remarkable, that though Dr. (now Archbishop) Laurence's publication came out after Mr. Biddulph's, this learned replicant to Dr. Mant's opponents did not allude to Mr. Biddulph's work or hypothesis, but confined himself to Mr. Scott's view of the question. This could scarcely be because he had not heard of Mr. Biddulph's publication: for it formed a prominent feature in the controversy, and was talked of and reviewed by theologians and critics on both sides.* Neither could it be because the view taken by Mr. Biddulph was not worth refu-

* Mr. Biddulph has omitted, in his recent re-modelled publication, an appendix which appeared in the original work, and which he thus describes.

"To the first publication an appendix was subjoined, containing numerous extracts from the body of Protestant Confessions of faith; from the writings of our eminent Martyrs and Reformers, and other Divines who flourished about the time of the Reformation. To these were added quotations from nearly thirty Archbishops and Bishops of our church, from Jewel to Horsley; and from twenty-three other divines who had not attained to the episcopal rank. This appendix contained also extracts from forty-seven of the tracts, which have been published by 'the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.' All these extracts, some of which were extensive, appeared to contravene the doctrine that 'the inward and spiritual grace,' represented in baptism, is connected, exclusively and inclusively, with the outward and visible form of the baptismal ordinance."

The present Bishop of Calcutta also published a list of decisive extracts to the same effect. The reply made to these citations was, that they proved nothing except that many of our most eminent Divines had used the expressions new-birth, regeneration, and their synonimes, "in a lax way," but that in strict speaking they *ought* to have confined them to the effects of baptism. It was replied, that they had only used them as they found them in the New Testament.

tation. The reason was generally considered to be, that Dr. Laurence could not reply to Mr. Biddulph without censuring the Christian Knowledge Society for making the distinction of "baptismal and spiritual regeneration;" and for publishing Bishop Bradford's sermon, and calling it "judicious and scriptural." We happen to have in our hands a letter from Mr. Biddulph, written two-and-twenty years ago, in which he alludes to Dr. Laurence's publication and his own work, and points out a most material "shifting of the ground" which occurred in this controversy. Dr. Mant's sermon, as we ourselves heard him preach it at Oxford, in his Bampton Lectures, and as he published it in those lectures, and also afterwards as a tract, and as it was at first circulated by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, said only baptism "rightly administered;" thus putting altogether aside the inquiry as to whether it was *rightly received*; and making the grace to flow *ex opere operato*, by the act of the priest, and not as the Church of England does in connexion with the repentance and faith of the recipient. This Romanist view of the doctrine being strongly and justly objected to, the words "rightly received" were at length added; though it was still contended that they were superfluous, for that baptism being generally administered to infants, and these "opposing no obstacle," (the well known Tridentine phrase, "obicem non ponentes) right administration was necessarily right reception; and the *opus operatum* was valid because it was *opus* BENE *operatum*.*

---

* Mr. Biddulph's letter being in our hands, we will transcribe his remarks, which explain two or three particulars not noticed in his publication. We may perhaps as well copy the whole letter, as a specimen of the familiar epistolary style of this father in Christ, and of the kindness with which he was wont to condescend to his younger brethren, encouraging them in their labours, and aiding them with his advice and experience; and, we may add, of the frank confidence with which, though naturally somewhat reserved, he expressed to them his opinions upon passing events, where he thought it might be useful; and of the fatherly consideration with which, notwithstanding the onerous pressure of his duties, he invited their correspondence, in order that he might be able to impart to them some spiritual gift. We ought perhaps to remark, as he speaks of probably being defended in the Christian Observer, that, though he was writing to the present editor of that work, it was before his connection with it, so that he was not covertly furnishing hints for his own defence. We shall feel grateful to any of our correspondents who can favour us with interesting particulars of his life, or valuable selections from his letters—which were often "weighty and powerful"—to engraft upon our intended memoir of him.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,

"I was greatly disappointed, when passing through —— a fortnight ago, in missing the pleasure I had promised myself in your company for a few hours. I called on Mr. ——— as soon as I arrived, expecting there to learn your abode, that I might solicit your society for that evening and the next morning. But I found you were absent from home. I however called at your door the next morning, in my way from the poor blind basket-maker's (an old friend of mine), and left a card. Our excursion from this place to Dawlish, (where Mrs. Biddulph's brother, Colonel Shrapnell, who is occasionally your hearer, has been for some time) [prosecuting his experiments on projectiles for government], was made in pursuit of health for my eldest daughter, who has been in a state that has occasioned us much anxiety for some months past. The excursion, short as it was, for we returned hither on the Friday, more than answered our expectations. Though I cannot say she is convalescent, she is certainly better, and we hope will soon be quite restored to her usual health.

"I delayed answering your kind letter, the date of which I am ashamed to look at, in consequence of the hurry and bustle of my residence in Bristol, and of a hope of having more leisure when I got to this place. And

We will conclude these cursory notices with a passage from Mr. Biddulph's preface, which, now that he has gone to his rest, is doubly impressive; and, we trust, will leave on our own minds, and on those of our readers, a more salutary influence than that too often engendered by controversial discussions. It will not be long, at the longest, before the solemn reality whether we are really born again of God, and made meet for the kingdom of heaven, will cast into the darkest shade all doubtful speculations. Alas! what to us then will it be, that we have been addressed as men justified in baptism, and as entitled to the name of saints and beloved children of God, if we be not partakers of spiritual as well as outward sacramental union to Christ, and of a true, living, and justifying faith, which purifies the heart, overcomes the world, substantiates things hoped for, and is the evidence of things unseen.

---

when I got hither, I looked forward with a hope of seeing you. Be assured that my seeming neglect was not occasioned by want of regard. After you left ——— for ———, I regretted exceedingly that I did not formally request you to write to me, and felt very anxious to hear from you; and when your letter arrived, it gave me no common degree of pleasure. I hope indeed, my dear friend, that your ministry will prove a light shining effectually in a dark place, to the illumination of many souls, who will be your crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus.

"You have probably seen the answers which have appeared, to Mr. Scott and myself, on the subject of regeneration, viz. 'Dr. Mant's Sermon on Regeneration vindicated from the Remarks of the Rev. T. T. Biddulph, by a Member of the Salop District Committee, &c.;' and Dr. Laurence's 'Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism vindicated from Misrepresentation.' The latter takes no notice of my book, but is aimed entirely against Mr. Scott. Both these vindicators have shifted most unfairly the ground of controversy—stating Dr. Mant's position to be, that baptism *rightly received* is always accompanied with grace. Had this been Dr. Mant's thesis, I should never have objected to his statement in print, however I might have differed from him in minor matters. While I think my Salop critic open to severe remark in reply, I have at present no intention of publishing a rejoinder. What I did last year I did for the satisfaction of my own conscience, as a member of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge; and having honestly entered my protest against their erroneous doctrine, I shall leave the contest in the hands of younger and abler combatants. I never was cut out for controversy. I am conscious of wanting the talents which it requires; and my feelings are, and always have been, abhorrent from it. I conclude that Mr. Scott will reply to Dr. Laurence; and probably some friend in the Christian Observer will, like one of Homer's deities, spread his broad shield around me. Have you seen 'Colquhoun on the Law and Gospel?' He is a Scottish divine. It was recommended to me, and I have read it with much pleasure. I wish it were recommended to notice in these days of wild extravagance, when the foundations of sound doctrine are attempted to be razed by the precipitation of youthful ignorance and zeal without sobriety.

"I am here in the midst of the new lights. [He alludes to the schism of the Rev. G. Baring and his friends.] They preach in one of the parishes which I serve, and in that also in which I reside, every week. Among the illiterate they are making a considerable impression. But I conceive it is merely a meteoric appearance, which, however portentous, will have its use in the spiritual atmosphere, though perhaps we may not be able fully to ascertain that use. A thick fog had long hung over this neighbourhood; perhaps Baring-ism may help to remove it, and occasion a freer circulation of spiritual light and air.

"Thanks for your hint for the improvement of a second edition of my book. I have no expectation that it will reach a second edition; if it should, I will attend to your suggestion.—Believe me, my dear friend, affectionately yours, THOS. T. BIDDULPH.

"*July* 16, 1816.

"I have filled my paper before I have said all I wished to say."

"To one who has attained the seventy-fourth year of his age, and has been just restored from an illness, which had placed him on the very verge of an eternal world, the censure or praise of man must be supposed to be of very little consequence. To approve himself to that adorable Being, 'to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid,' and before whom he is shortly to appear; and to promote, so far as his means of doing it extend, the spiritual benefit of his fellow-sinners,—has been, he hopes, the single motive which has influenced him in the republication of the following pages, for which a period of confinement from parochial duties has furnished the needful leisure. If it should prove the means of exciting a spirit of prayerful investigation on the momentous subject to which it relates—the surest way of attaining to a safe decision—his time will not have been misemployed. If proof should be given that he has been in error, and if that error should be demonstrated to him before his now approaching dismission from the church militant here on earth, the discovery will be a subject for deep humiliation and pungent sorrow in his dying moments. But he believes, after long and deep consideration, that the view which he has taken is correct, and that the opinions which he opposes are not only erroneous in themselves, but possess also a dangerous tendency—a tendency, hostile to the true interests of the national Church in this alarming crisis of her history. That nothing presumptuously dogmatical, and nothing savouring, in the least degree, of an unkind or uncharitable spirit, might be found to deface the following pages, with respect to his brethren from whom he is obliged by the dictates of conscience to differ, and to whom he gives full credit for sincerity in the course which they pursue, has been his earnest and constant aim while engaged in the discussion which he presents to public notice."

UNJUST CONDUCT OF QUAKERS RESPECTING TITHE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE united with members of the Society of Friends in works of general benevolence, but their conduct respecting the payment of tithes has given me a very unfavourable idea of their principles. I will suppose that a Quaker, a man of high character and religious profession in the Society, some time since purchased some land, part of which was subject to tithe and part tithe free; and that for the latter portion he paid its full value; but with regard to the former, he made the most careful inquiries as to what had been the usual outgoing for tithe, and bargained hard in the purchase money in order to cover this liability. I will further suppose, that having obtained the property with this foreknown drawback upon it, for which a more than adequate deduction from the price was allowed, he now refuses to pay the tithe, and pockets its value; which the tithe-owner cannot recover without the pain and popular odium of procuring a distress warrant upon the wrong-doer's property; at the risk of injuring his own ministry, and being held up to reproach as a persecutor. Can I reconcile this proceeding with common honesty? I used to read the Quaker's annual Epistle with much pleasure; but when I found that under the words "sufferings," "persecutions," or the like, they include the legal recovery of money which they owe but refuse to pay, I became disgusted with such a system of injustice and falsehood. If I bought a house of a Quaker, and he apprised me that there was an annuity secured upon it, and made ample allowance for this in the price, would it not be cheating for me to avail myself of the low terms, and then refuse to pay the annuity? and what hypocrisy would it be, when the injured party peaceably sought his legal remedy, for me to publish throughout the land my sufferings and persecutions!

The Quaker replies, that he objects upon principle to the claim. This sounds well; but then why did he buy property knowing it to be subject to that claim, giving for it a less price than was just irrespective of it? Again: when he sells a field, why does he ask more for it because it is tithe-free, than he would ask if it were not so? Is this upright? I cannot see how an honest Quaker reconciles it to his conscience to pocket what is not his own, as he always does *in intention*, when he refrains from paying till the law compels him; and as he often does *in reality*, where tithe-owners yield their right rather than resort to law to enforce it. It seems to me that a conscientious Quaker ought to go to the tithe-owner and say, "I cannot pay you tithe as an ecclesiastical demand; but I have made more by my field than the average return of property in the neighbourhood for the sum which I gave for it, because that sum supposed the deduction of tithe. I dare not retain the difference; it would eat as a canker; and to whom can I render it but to you?" I rejoice that the commutation of tithe will put an end to these difficulties, but this does not justify the conduct of the Quakers.

JUSTUS.

ON THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

WITH respect to the restoration of the Jewish nation to the land of Palestine, permit me to refer your readers to Mr. Faber's work on that subject, and also to his "Sacred Calendar of Prophecy." The reasons which he has given for a literal restoration of the ancient people of God to their land are to my mind satisfactory and convincing. Even if there were no other passage to prove it, the one where God declares that it shall in future times be said, "The Lord liveth, who brought up and who led the children of Israel out of *the north country*, and *from all the countries whither I had driven them*, and they *shall dwell in their own land*," would, I think, be sufficient to prove it; because it seems too minute and circumstantial to admit of a merely figurative interpretation; and, indeed, what can it be a figure of? what is the reality which the figure is supposed to represent? I would also ask, if a prophecy were intended to declare a literal restoration, what more plain and forcible terms could have been made use of? We should never resort to figures unless where the nature of the subject, or common sense, imperatively requires it.

CIVIS.

ON THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

ALLOW me to correct, through your pages, a misconception which I believe exists among some of our southern brethren respecting the position of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Never having belonged to the Presbyterian establishment, we are not Dissenters; but having been deprived of our public status at the Revolution, we have ever

since remained quietly in the character of a protesting body, and have realized, more than most other denominations, one of the essential characters of a Christian community, namely, the Pastoral. Unless, however, we maintain our church principles, we are immediately lost amongst the numerous sectaries with which we are surrounded; and this will account for the prominence which we give to "Apostolic order;" for we have had experience of men even of piety, but of what are called "liberal" views, coming amongst us, who, while the novelty lasted, preached a church full, and then—preached it empty and left it. So that we desire, if possible, to conjoin the "Apostolical order" with the "Evangelical truth," believing that the Apostles' doctrine cannot be long or consistently preserved without a "stedfast continuance" in the Apostles' "fellowship."

I need not inform you that our Church has long had serious difficulties to struggle with; and even now we greatly need the prayers and sympathies of our brethren; and in some instances their pecuniary aid; as from the scattered condition of our members, and other circumstances, the expense of building churches, providing, as our holy religion enjoins and as we feel it a pleasure to do, for those who minister in them, and supporting schools and other Christian institutions, is necessarily heavy, so that we cannot do all that we desire; but I trust that our brethren in the south will unite with us in praying that our efforts may be overruled and directed by the Great Head of the Church to his glory and our own spiritual good.

A LAY MEMBER OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF SCRIPTURE NAMES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Is THERE any established canon for the pronunciation of the Scripture names which occur in our English translation of the Bible? It appears to me that in this matter we should be guided by the rules of our own language. Yet I sometimes hear these rules violated, when, for example, Cephas is pronounced Kephas—and Cherubim and Cherubic are changed into Kerubim and Kerubic; and I feel much at a loss to know what authority there can be for such changes. If they were not made by men of sense and learning, I should not hesitate to say that they were made in defiance of good taste and propriety, to the great perplexity too of the multitude—and in opposition to the intention of our translators; who, had they wished to transfer into English the Hebrew and Greek pronunciations, would have spelled the words accordingly:—as it is, I dare not say a word. I would merely inquire respectfully how it happens that they who call Cephas, Kephas, do not also call Charity, Karity.

Ελπις.

*** There is not, and cannot be, any general "canon" for the pronunciation of foreign names, whether they belong to a dead or a living language. We apprehend that the best course is, where foreign words are in common use, to take the popular pronunciation; but where common use has not determined any particular pronunciation, to follow in general the analogy of the language in which

we are reading, though sometimes perhaps deviating from it in favour of the original word, where it can be done without pedantry and with good effect. It would be ridiculous for an Englishman, in saying "I am going to Paris," to give to so familiar a word as Paris its French sound; but he might Gallicise without offence in saying, "I am going to St. Cloud or St. Amand." So a clergyman should undoubtedly accent Eubulus, Aristobulus, and Andronicus on the penultimate syllable; it would be most unscholar-like to do otherwise; but it would be affectation to accent Samaria or Cyrenians in the same manner, though the penultimate in the original is diphthongal. No reason can be given for this difference, except that the two latter words have come to be Anglicised, whereas the three former are not so familiar to the popular ear as to forbid a tacit recurrence to the original. As the Greek diphthongs are not distinguished in our English Bibles, Æschines and Æschylus, if they occurred there, would be spelled Eschines and Eschylus (as they often are elsewhere), and as the analogy of the English language is to *shut* and shorten the first syllable of trisyllables thus circumstanced, the familiar pronunciation would have been Esschines, Esschylus: not Ese-chines, Ese-chylus; and it would have been a point for consideration, whether a speaker could, without affectation, violate the analogy of the language in which he was reading, in order to shew that the first syllable is a diphthong in the original. In the case of words fairly popularised from Greek or Hebrew, through Latin, French, or English, it is pedantic to go back to the first etymology; and the worst of such pedantry is that it is piebald; it lays hold of a sound or letter here and there, whereas, to be consistent with itself, it should refer everything back to the original; it should not be content, in order to shew its knowledge of quantity, with lengthening the first syllable in Æschines and Æschylus, which the analogy of English pronunciation tends to shorten; but it should carry the same rule throughout all other words; it should not pronounce the first syllable of Campana and Camœnæ alike; but should make the former long, by drawling out the *a*, and the latter short; it should say *bonnus* for bonus, and *cannis* for canis, in order to shew that the *o* and the *a* are short; and it should pronounce *mālus*, an apple-tree, differently from *mălus*, bad; in a word, it must entirely new-fashion our pronunciation of classical words; and accordingly in former years the majority of scholars, in reading English, refused to lengthen the first syllable in Æschylus, as much as to shorten the first in *bonus*; considering that Greek and Latin being dead languages, we follow the ordinary habits of our own tongue in speaking them; making no account whatever of longs and shorts, except to decide whether we shall place the accent on the penultimate or the ante-penultimate.

If indeed the modern usage of scholars has been to notify the diphthong in a few words, where the analogy of English speaking without reference to the Greek original would have made no such distinction, any more than it would distinguish in sound the short *o* in *bonus*, from the long *o* in *Roma*, it might be thought unscholar-like not to follow the example, where the discriminating sound has gained currency, though it would not be easy to say why we should affect to Grecise in one instance, while in the vast majority of sounds we Anglicise. Except so far as usage decides the point, we ought as much to shew our Latin by saying an orátor and a mendícant, accenting these words on the second syllable and making it long, as our Greek by lengthening the first syllable of Æschylus, which it is the genius of English pronunciation to shorten.

The same remarks may be applied to the case mentioned by our correspondent, of the use of the hard or soft sound of C, and we may add of G; for the analogy takes in oxygen, hydrogen, Egypt, and heterogeneous, as much as Cephas, Cedron,

or Aceldama. If a word be not in some measure Anglicised, the reader may, we think, be allowed to recollect its origin, and to say Phygellus (with gamma) and Akeldama; though we would not set him down as unlearned if he preferred, even in such words as these, the English fashion. Kedron for Cedron is much more violent; though as Kedron occurs in the Psalms, and is read in church much oftener than Cedron, the sound is not novel to the English ear; and it is perhaps expected by some persons as a test of classical scholarship. But to say Kephas or Kerubic, is outrageous; and the clergyman who has so little judgment as to fall into such an error, ought also to say Kyrus, and Kyrene, and Kilicia, and Skythian, and Kesar's household. He can give no reason in the one case which does not equally apply to the other. Does he call his children kerubs?

We know not how the ancients pronounced their words; and if we did, it would be ridiculous to ape them in reading English. Suppose we felt persuaded that the sound which a Frenchman or an Italian gives to a classical word was the real original sound, still we could not adopt it without absurdity. Kesar for Cæsar or Kaisar, would not be English, nor would it be Latin or Greek; but mere pedantic jargon.

We are not at all daunted by what our correspondent says about men of "sense and learning." Those who have the highest claim to such titles are not apt to be carried away by fopperies of diction. They see at once that language is too arbitrary to be trammelled by classical fetters. We should say that it is "a little learning," and the absence of that large induction which good "sense" suggests, which betray some men from schools and colleges into mistakes which mere vernacular readers escape. It does not, for example, require much learning to ascertain that "knowledge" is based on "know," and the first impulse of a man who studies verbal correctness is to alter the popular pronunciation; but larger induction shews him that if he do so he must go on to alter the general habits of the English, and probably of every other, language; as, for example, turning *shepherd* into *sheepherd; vineyard* (pronounced vinyurd) into *vine-*YARD; and forgetting that *mead* is shortened in *meadow; wise,* in *wisdom; vale,* in *valley; clean,* in *cleanly; break,* in *breakfast; kind,* in *kindred;* and so on in cases innumerable. He pronounces the name of our Lord long as much as he does the verb *know;* but he surely does not keep up this long sound when he says, "I *christ-ened* a child."

The Rev. Sidney Smith has just exhibited to the world, in his last letter on Church matters, a proof how ignorant a man, even of his academical education and sprightly talents, may be in a matter which any boy at a common English school could understand. He says, "Young Crumpet spends the best years of his life, as all eminent Englishmen do, in making Latin verses, and knows that the *crum* in crumpet is long, and the *pet* short." Now it is impossible to make an accented vowel shorter than the *u* in crumpet; it is indeed quite as short as the unaccented *e* in pet; and the whole syllable *crum,* even with its two liquid consonants *r* and *m,* is still a short syllable. It seems incredible that any educated man could make such a blunder; and our only solution is, that Sidney Smith must surely pronounce the *u* broadly, *croompet*—which, indeed, makes it long; but this is not according to the national standard of educated speaking. We cannot suppose that because the *crum* is accented he concluded that it must be long, and the contrary of the syllable *pet;* though, strange as it may appear, we have known scholars who had so long used words without ideas, and without employing their ears or feelings to test the truth of what they affirmed, that they actually insisted that a crotchet was short and a quaver long, because the

accent happened to fall on the latter, and the former was unaccented, though a child who had never heard of longs or shorts could have felt as plainly as if he were a living stop-watch or metronome, that the crotchet was longer than the quaver; and could be made to understand that in saying *crum*, in *crumpet*, the organs of voice make a stroke (which is called accent), and upon *pet* return for a new stroke; but whether they make the stroke in longer time (as *croom*) or shorter (as *crum*) this has nothing to do with the accent. It is likely enough that when Master Sydney Smith accented a word incorrectly, his schoolmaster used to ask him whether the penultima was long or short, in order to remind him of his mistake, having previously informed him that when the penultimate was long he was to place the accent on it, and when short, was to accent the ante-penultimate; and that poor Sidney hence inferred that accent and quantity are convertible terms. Errors quite as gross as poor Master Crumpet's are constantly arising from an unskilful application of classical rules and usages to English pronunciation.

The result of these remarks is, that in bringing philology to bear upon vernacular speaking we should take care that it does not go beyond its legitimate province. As truly now as in the days of Horace, custom — the ordinary custom of liberally-educated persons—is the canon of speaking; so that even if it should chance that our vernacular mode of pronouncing Cephas or Samaria is not so near the old Greek pronunciation, as Kephas and Samareia, it does not follow that a clergyman does well to distract the attention of the worshippers in the house of God, by such an unusual enunciation; any more than he would do well, in ordinary English conversation, to pronounce Paris or Lyons as he would pronounce them in France; or to attempt to fashion his organs of speech to all the sounds of all the languages in the world, learnedly teaching us that what we call an Esquimaux, or a Kamskatchan, ought to be called something very different. At this very time a controversy is going on in India, in consequence of innovations of this nature, by some who have discovered that the popular English pronunciation of native names of places is not correct. Who ever supposed that it was correct, if by correctness be meant uniformity? There is no nation in the world in which the names of the places in foreign lands are written and spoken as they are by the natives of those countries. Italy, Sicily, Lisbon, Madrid, Constantinople, as Englishmen pronounce them, are not words which would be recognized by the natives of the countries or cities which we thus designate. But we must take words and sounds as we find them conventionally agreed upon. Where a word, quite new to the public ear, is adopted in any language, it is doubtless well to embody the native sound of it in letters, as nearly as convenience will allow; but it is miserable affectation, where a particular form has been well established, to change it; as, for instance, to write Kalikata for Calcutta; Mandraj for Madras; Shrirampur for Serampore; Chunchura for Chinsura; Khanpur for Cawnpore; and Bangala for Bengal. Yet even this is not so violent as Kephas or Kerubic; besides which, as already remarked, in affecting peculiar accuracy in one word, we expose ourselves to the charge of inaccuracy in many, for it is impossible to follow up the practice consistently. Even if we ventured as far as Makeddonnia, and Kesar's household, and the Samarī-tans, and were to read "*Petter* to the strangers scattered throughout *Pontoos*, Galatī-a; Kappadokkia, &c." this would be but a drop in the ocean to the full tide of analogous innovation which would be requisite. We are not inventing ridiculous instances. Dr Carey, in his Latin Prosody, quoting the authority of Statius for the quantity of the penultimate in Galatīa, seriously exhorts: "Hence let us say, The epistle of St. Paul to the

Galatí-ans, not Galá-tians." If a clergyman were to say so, he certainly would not be a man of "sense," whatever might be his erudition in the mysteries of longs and shorts. Yet we could not bring any argument against him but that custom has sanctioned in vernacular English reading Galá-tians, and not Galatí-ans. He may reply, You would not say Emmá-us, or Patró-bas, or Parmé-nas, or Andrón-icus, or Aristób-ulus, instead of Emmaus, Pátrobas, Pármenas, Andronícus, and Aristobúlus; why then should you say Galá-tians, or Samáritans? Our only rejoinder is, that if the mistakes in the former class were as much familiarized as in the latter, we would rather violate the accents pointed out by classical quantity, than run the risk of pedantry; and what is worse, where the reading of the Scriptures is concerned, disturbing the attention of the hearer, and impeding edification. But happily we are not often reduced to this alternative; for it is only in a few of the proper names in the New Testament that vernacular usage is decided in placing the accent unclassically; there is not one word, for instance, in the sixteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans which we may not accent rightly, without offence to the most rustic hearer. As for Hebrew words, the rules for the pronunciation of them are uncertain and perplexing; and even if they were certain, they proceed upon principles and habits so far removed from the speech of Englishmen, that if the names in the Old Testament were pronounced in the manner which a Jew would say was correct, the great majority even of scholars would not recognize them. There seems, therefore, to be no rule but to follow the conventional pronunciation of proper names in frequent use; using our discretion as to being guided by the Hebrew sound, accent, or quantity (if we can ascertain them) in words of less familiar occurrence, provided we do not so violate the analogies of the English tongue as to seem to be interlarding it with words of foreign articulation. Our correspondent has referred to the *ch* in Cherubim; now this we should say is so determinately fixed among Englishmen to the soft sound by established usage, that we ought not to violate it; but we should nevertheless unquestionably use the hard sound in Chaldean, Charron, Chebar, Chemosh, Cherethites, Cherith, and Chenaniah; nor should we perhaps shrink from doing so even in Chimham; though it might be too startling to vernacular English hearers to say Kittim for Chittim, notwithstanding the *ch* is properly hard. But so are also the Latin *c* and *g*, and the Greek gamma and kappa, whatever may be the vowel which precedes them. We cannot therefore say that Kephas is not abstractedly right; and great have been the complaints of lexicographers and grammarians that we Englishmen, in reading Latin, often make *c* and *g* soft, (sounded like S and J), as in the English words *city* and *gipsey*. The *Kephalic* innovator has but to open his Ainsworth's dictionary under the letter C, to read, "The name of C, if we attend to analogy, is always Ke, as is its sound before all vowels, and never *Se*. And here, with reluctance, I remark that foreigners who own we understand Latin perfectly, and write it correctly, account us little better than barbarians in several parts of pronunciation, but in none more justly than our depraved sound of this letter C before æ, œ, e, i, and y, as if it were S, which, at the same time, our learned men confess to differ from the ancient usage of Greece and Rome, to be unreasonable in itself, and to introduce a strange confusion in words and things; so that cædo and sedo, cæpi and sepi, census and sensus, cicer, and siser, and many thousands more, have with us one and the same sound. This I leave to the consideration and redress of the learned schoolmasters of this kingdom, as very well deserving it; and return to its true sound, which is the same with that usurped by the exploded K." Upon G the same familiar authority

observes: "Both the Greeks and Romans always, and before all vowels, pronounced this letter hard, sounding γενος and *genus*, γιγας and *gigas*, as we do in *get* and *give*, never as we do in *generation* and *ginger*; which irregular and uncertain pronunciation of this letter, as well as the cognate *c*, proves often a great discouragement to those who desire to learn our tongue; and together with our different sound of the vowels, makes our Latin, though much purer generally than theirs, almost as unintelligible as our English." Of the letter J the same lexicographer says: "The true sound is near to our *y* before a vowel in the same syllable, and if we would follow analogy, it ought to be called *ye*."

These remarks, which certainly require no learning to comprehend, shew that, if English were Greek or Latin, it would be very right to say, in reading the English Bible, Kephas for Cephas; but then it would be equally right to say Kesar, and so forth; as also the book of *Genesis* with the soft G (as in Ghenesis), and the book of Yudges for Judges, and Yohn for John. The practical mistake alluded to by our corresponident, was not in supposing that the C in Cephas is hard in the original, for no one doubts it; but in inferring that therefore it ought to be so in reading the English Bible; whereas the same reason which would require the hard C in Cephas would require it wherever a C comes in any other word derived from Greek or Latin, and thus we should have a new language. If indeed the clergymen whom our correspondent refers to could succeed in universally changing our speech in these matters, they would give us a much more melodious language, but it would not be Queen Victoria's English. We must read, not only Kerubs and Kephas, but *diskiples*, and the prophets *Yeremiah* and *Yonas*, and, with the hard *g* (as in *give*) gender, and generation, and genius, and geography.

We had not the slightest intention of obtruding upon our readers these remarks; but our correspondent's letter having called our attention to the subject, we have hastily added them to his paper as it passes through our hands in its way to press, with a view to induce academical students and young clergymen to consider the question fully before they allow themselves, in search of unusual correctness, to innovate upon established modes of writing and speaking; the probability being that the primâ facie view is more specious than satisfactory. Let them be on their guard against bewildering themselves or others in running after phantoms of uniformity which they can never overtake. Still, it is not wise or kind to ridicule, as many persons are wont to do, a young man who in studying to speak correctly falls into a few such mistakes as *Kephas*, *bu-rial*, *de-signate*, and *quallity* (rhyming with *legality*), since such errors (provided he be not led away by self-conceit) are merely defects of judgment, from his considering the subject partially, instead of largely and in its general bearings. In some cases, students of good classical attainments are more ignorant of the living analogies of their own tongue, than many a well-informed young man who has studied only the popular orthoepists of his own land. A youth who had read only Walker's Dictionary, would see what ignorance it betrays of the habits of the English language to pronounce the *qual* in *quality*, as he does in the Latin word *qualitas*; or to say *know-ledge*, instead of knowledge as it is usually pronounced in the senate, at the bar, and in ordinary conversation. Why should the church, the place of all others where simplicity should never be lost sight of, be the theatre for such innovations? We should say that whenever a clergyman so pronounces any word as to attract the marked attention of a well-educated congregation, he is wrong; wrong probably in judgment—certainly wrong in taste: and if he do it for the sake of displaying his critical skill, wrong in morals.

REPLY TO REMARKS ON A POPULAR HYMN.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN reference to the well-known hymn which repeats the exclamation, "*Crown Him Lord of all,*" I do not, critically considered, dissent from the animadversions of X.I.Y., which I doubt not have been prompted by a laudable jealousy for the honour of the Saviour. I am however induced to ask, Are we called upon to be critical in such a case? If indeed, as your correspondent thinks, the hymn in question degrades, rather than magnifies, the King of kings, let it be no more used; and let us regret the mischief it must consequently have been the occasion of in the minds of the millions whose hearts have appeared to glow with sacred delight while they have sung it in "the great congregation." But my object is not to defend this particular hymn, except as hoping, by the occasion, to counteract in some small degree what I regard as an injurious spirit which is now, among other new things, playing its part in the Christian world. Every good man who discovers a supposed defect in that which has been long established, or long in use, I doubt not believes that in pointing it out he is "doing God service." He does not always recollect that the eye of the mind, like that of the body, can often assimilate itself with pleasure and profit to that which, when its defects are pointed out, can no longer be enjoyed; and as I believe the "heart is often made better" by that which mixes defect with what is truly excellent and delectable, I have a doubt whether the critic is, upon the whole, a benefactor in the Christian world or not.

What your correspondent feels in reference to the hymn in question, arises, I apprehend, from his not adverting to the material distinction which exists between what is *declarative* and what is *illustrative*. If the Almighty himself is pleased to illustrate his own authority, as the Sovereign of the universe, by a reference to thrones and crowns and sceptres; that a Christian poet should carry on the illustration somewhat further, is, I submit, no violation of the principle sanctioned by Scripture. But if, in a commentary or book of instruction, a writer had stated that there would probably be hereafter a Celestial Imperial coronation of the Son of God, to which the assent of all created intelligences would be called for, in such case animadversions much more castigatory than your correspondent has administered would be well merited. I may, however, safely appeal to all the singers of the hymn referred to, whether any one of them ever supposed that it set forth a fact or ceremony which it was expected would actually take place. I believe there is discernment enough in the most ignorant to perceive that the invocation, "*Crown Him Lord of all,*" is nothing more or less than the supposed language of every heart throughout creation acquiescing and glorifying in the fact that the Redeemer is, and ever shall be, by undisputed right and by infinite pre-eminence, Lord of all. Indeed, that the call is *immediate*, and not prospective, teaches every common understanding that the language is poetical and figurative: it does not say, He *shall be* crowned; but makes every man, woman, and child call, at the present moment, upon "Martyrs, seraphs, morning stars, &c., &c." to bring forth the "royal diadem," while they are singing; which no one's imagination shapes, or can shape, into a reality. If your corre-

spondent's argument be correct, then it follows as a matter of course, that all comparison with earthly things must necessarily degrade those which relate to Heaven, and Him who dwelleth therein; but the same Being who knoweth whereof we are made, has condescended to the comparison in His sacred word, times without number.

VICANUS.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

For the Christian Observer.

TRANSLATION OF FRENCH LINES.

(*The following lines were written by Antoine, Lord of Chandieu, who embraced the Reformed faith, and died at Geneva*, 1591.)

	TRANSLATION.
Le beau du monde s'efface,	Earth's best joys must glide away,
Soudain, comme un vent qui passe;	Like sweet breath of summer's day;
Soudain, comme on voit la fleure,	Transient, as we see the flower
Sans sa première couleur;	Lose its first tints in an hour;
Soudain, comme une onde qui fuit	As the streamlet's wave that dies,
Devant l'autre qui la suit.	And the next its place supplies.
Qu'est ce donc que le monde?	What then if the world we deem,
Un vent, une fleur, une onde!	But a breath, a flower, a stream?

T. S.

PARAPHRASE OF A LATIN EPITAPH.

(*Lines on the monument of an infant in Trinity Church, Cambridge.*)

Innocens, et perbeatus,	Free from stain, and full of bliss,
More florum decidi.	I am where my Saviour is.
Quid sepultum fles, amice?	Budding here, a germ of love,
Flente sum felicior.	Blooming in his bower above.
	At my lot then why repine?
	Happier portion far than thine!

T. S.

THE RESTLESS NIGHT.

I never will sigh for the dream of my youth,
'Twas, alas! but a foolish dream;
It vanished before the approach of truth,
Ithuriel's spear's first gleam.

But, oh! I must sigh for my youthful rest,
My pleasant, my peaceful sleep,
When soon as my sorrowless pillow I prest,
I sank in a slumber deep.

Now vainly I woo thee by every charm,
Still, still thou fliest me;
And fruitless I think on all things of calm,
To work a spell for thee.

In fancy I list to the far-off tide,
The boom of the distant billow;
Or watch the streamlet rippling glide,
As it kisses the pendent willow.

Then I image the gently waving corn,
Sighing soft to the summer breeze;
Or hear in the wind, to some forest borne,
A spirit's voice 'mid the trees.

And then I bemuse on some distant view,
In the morn's calm dreamy light;
Eve's shadowy haze of greyish hue;
Or the twinkling stars of night.

And sometimes I watch the lithe flag play,
As the zephyr sportive blows;
Or the anchored bark with its see-saw sway,
Bid lull me to repose.

Or then I depicture the windmill sail,
With the swing of its giant arm;
But nothing, alas! these spells avail,
To weave a drowsy charm.

Nor poppy nor mandragora's powers
Can give me that sleep again;
Yet let me not pass these restless hours,
If toilsome, at least in vain.

O Giver of every perfect gift,
This good thing give to me;
That 'mid the still watch of the darkest night,
My heart may rise to thee!

E. L. A.

"BUT ARE AS THE ANGELS OF GOD IN HEAVEN."—(Matt. xxii. 30.)

To be like to the angels,
Are these words on my heart?
Oh, feign would I grasp
The bright thoughts they impart.

I will think on the angels,
Bring their joys to my view;
I shall love all that's good,
I shall know all that's true.

Not an error to darken,
Not a sin to deplore;
Delighting in knowledge
And truth evermore.

But no thought can conceive
The full bliss we shall prove;
When the whole of our being
Shall be love—perfect love.

E. L. A.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

HARE'S SERMONS TO A COUNTRY CONGREGATION.

Sermons to a Country Congregation. By AUGUSTUS WILLIAM HARE, A.M., late Fellow of New College; and Rector of Alton Barnes. Third Edition. 2 vols. London, 1838.

WE have within arm's length, while we are writing, some thirty or forty volumes of sermons, published within half that number of months, the majority of which we cannot attempt to overtake in our review department; though we hope not to leave unnoticed a few of those which, from the character of their contents, or the station or celebrity of their authors, peculiarly demand attention. From India we have a volume of discourses, characterised by the well-known fervour, the pure evangelical doctrine, and the heart-

searching application of it to the conscience, of Bishop Wilson. Sir R. H. Inglis has revived our recollections, and enlarged our knowledge, of the beloved Bishop Heber, by three interesting volumes of his parochial sermons while ministering as a village pastor. The Rev. C. Ives has just given to the world a volume of sermons, partly new and partly reprints, from the pen of his learned and munificent relative, the late Bishop Van Mildert, with a memoir of the author. From Ireland we have twenty-one sermons by the faithful and venerable B. W. Matthias; and a second volume of discourses by Mr. Woodward, the rapidly extensive circulation of whose former volume leads us to hope, that warmly as we expressed ourselves respecting its moral, intellectual, and spiritual beauty, and practical value, our estimate was not overcharged. We must not commence a list of sermons by private clergymen at home, as in naming a few we might pass over others as deserving of notice. For the most part, volumes of sermons, from their very multiplicity, have only a local sale, among the flock and friends of the author; but this testimony of esteem, where the writer is known and valued, is of far greater worth than mere literary renown, even if it were attainable, which it rarely is, in this branch of authorship. We rejoice to witness the great improvement in the doctrinal character and seriousness of address of the majority of published sermons during the last few years above those which were current as late as a quarter of a century ago. We rarely meet with such grossly false doctrine as that men are justified by works and not by faith; or with denouncement of all zeal and earnestness in religion, under the stigma of methodism and enthusiasm. The meagre jejune essays which Secker, Horsley, Porteus, and Barrington justly complained of, as an aping of Epictetus, instead of preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ, have sunk into deserved disrepute. There is greater seriousness, greater earnestness, and a much larger introduction of scriptural topics, even where there is not a clear exposition and forcible application of the "doctrines of grace." But blessed be God, beyond this, there is a large supply of the pure waters of salvation directly from the well-spring of inspired truth; and though the opponents of the Gospel are fain to tell us that there is no certainty in its doctrines, and some of its erring advocates echo back the cry by affirming that without tradition this would really be the case, yet we rejoice to see a practical negative given to these disparaging statements in the numerous volumes of truly evangelical discourses which issue from the press; proving how clearly the word of God is explained, and how faithfully it is enforced, in parishes innumerable; "clouds of witnesses" concurring as to the result of their anxious and prayerful examination of the record which God has given of his Son.

It is not, however, with a view to doctrinal discussion that we have taken up the posthumous volumes now in our hands; but for the convenience which they present to us of offering a few remarks upon the general style and structure of sermons. The question is often asked, How comes it to pass that there is no more apparent fruit gathered in from year to year as the produce of the pulpit labours of the English clergy? Many answers are given to this inquiry, by persons representing various classes, into which our community is divided.

One perhaps says, "The times are altered; the clergyman no longer stands upon the vantage ground which he formerly occupied, as the authorised and unquestioned expounder of God's word; the political fever has made the mass of our population restless and dissatisfied; and the Church, in common with all our established institutions, is suffering from the calumnies which are industriously propagated by turbulent men for their own selfish purposes. The pastoral tie is weakened; suspicion and distrust have taken the place of that habitual deference with which a former generation listened to those who were over them in the Lord; and no wonder therefore that men do not listen very reverently to teachers whom they have been taught to despise." Another assigns a very different reason; "The fault," he says, "is in the clergy themselves; too many of them do not faithfully preach the Gospel; wherever men are found to declare the true doctrines of the Church of England, you will see their churches filled, and that God gives an abundant blessing to their ministry. Put such a clergyman in every parish, and, by the blessing of God, fruitfulness will soon succeed to barrenness." Another will maintain, on the contrary, that the influence of the clergy, as a body, with their flocks has declined just in proportion as what is popularly called the Evangelical School has multiplied; and that what is wanted is a better understanding of what the objector considers true Church principles, a bolder assertion of ministerial authority, and a more strict enforcement of ecclesiastical rule and order, in which—we are not admitting the truth of the charge—he thinks this body deficient. A fourth will allege that many very zealous men, and some of the most popular preachers in the Church, so far from ranging freely over the wide field of instruction which the Bible presents to them, confine themselves within very narrow limits; and, with little variety of topic or illustration, pursue from year to year one beaten track, and reiterate, without making plainer, a few of the cardinal doctrines of our faith, till the attention of many of their hearers is wearied, and the prejudices of not a few become confirmed and strengthened.

Now, though far indeed from attaching slight importance either to soundness of doctrine or apostolical discipline; and firmly believing that the simple faithful preaching of Christ crucified, in all the Scriptural largeness of that phrase, is that which God honours and blesses to the conversion of sinners and the edification of the faithful; we may still lawfully inquire whether in the style and structure of pulpit compositions there is any thing which, humanly speaking, detracts from their efficacy; and in this respect we do not think that the replies above given, either separately or combined, fully account for the phenomenon under consideration. We are speaking not merely of the failure of our parochial clergy in their endeavours to make their flocks intelligent, devout, humble, watchful, and diligent Christians, men loving and adorning the truth as it is in Jesus, but of the little effect *of any kind* that is produced by their public instructions. Of course we mean little *comparatively;* for, upon the whole, looking at the length and breadth of the land, we cannot doubt that the result is immense;—multitudes of souls gathered into Christ's fold, the boldness of the wicked abashed, the wavering kept from the paths of the destroyer, the first faint spark of Divine love fanned into a bright and steady flame, the shining light of the established saint made

to advance continually toward the perfect day, and lastly, a healthful though inadequate moral feeling kept up, which pervades every part of the social fabric from its summit to its base, affects more or less all our dealings with each other, and, (with the exception of the outlaws of the community, the thoroughly lost and abandoned) enters into the composition of each man's character.

But still, looking at the numerous sermons which are preached, the pains bestowed upon them, the talent and piety displayed in them, the advantageous position occupied by the minister who delivers them, his position in society, his official character, and commonly his habits of friendly intercourse with his hearers, we must say that, Sunday by Sunday, little, *strangely* little, comes of them. The fruit of this weekly contact between the minds of the teacher and the taught is much less than might be expected; less knowledge is imparted; fewer errors are corrected; a smaller amount of interest is excited; and, what is most important of all, sinners are reclaimed and souls converted in a much smaller measure than we should previously have anticipated.

With reference to this last, the highest aim of the Christian ministry, we do not forget whose prerogative it is to "give the increase;" and abhorred be the thought of disparaging or losing sight of that Divine influence by which in every instance a sinner is persuaded to "believe unto righteousness;" but still we generally find that God does not withhold an encouraging measure of success from the faithful and hearty endeavours of his servants; and moreover, without the special aid of the life-giving Spirit, much fruit of *a certain kind* might be seen; men might learn to value more the opportunity of receiving a weekly lesson on the most important subjects from a mind superior to their own; attention might be more awake; habits more in unison with the strain of our pulpit exhortations might be growing up; even for the mental excitement which it produces, a sermon, that comes but weekly, and is so soon over, might be chosen before the stroll abroad, or the idle lounge at home, which are now so frequently preferred.

One main reason, we believe, why at least *this* result is not more often seen, and why more extensive good of a yet higher kind does not ensue where the natural powers of the minister are really consecrated to God, is that there is a want of adaptation between the preacher's language and the minds of his hearers. Independently of the substance and matter of his discourse, the thoughts embodied in it, the doctrines stated, the precepts enforced, the warnings or the invitations given, the dress in which they are clothed is foreign to his audience; their minds are not familiar with the prominent ideas; and the illustrations by which he would make his meaning plain are too often drawn from a world in which few of them live. Every clergyman who has laboured among our rural population, and has had much of intercourse with his people in their cottages, will allow that every year's experience convinces him more and more how imperfectly he is understood by his people. The extreme narrowness of their range of thought becomes increasingly manifest to him; and the mode of address which he thought quite plain at first, he finds must be simplified yet more before he can be said fairly to reach their understanding.

Now our principal reason for introducing the volumes which stand at the head of this article

to the notice of our readers, is that they afford some highly important lessons in the study of this valuable art of simplification. We will illustrate our meaning by a quotation from a sermon entitled "Principles above Rules," upon the text, Col. ii. 20.

"A rule which has been drawn up for any particular purpose, may be likened to a loaf of bread; a principle, on the other hand, is like a handful of wheat. Every rule that is worth anything must be taken from a principle, just as a loaf of bread is made of wheat. For the wants and uses of the moment a rule is more serviceable than a principle; just as when a man is hungry, bread is more welcome than wheat. For bread is wheat ready prepared for the sake of satisfying hunger: we have only to take and eat it. Hence, for a hungry man, a crust of bread is better and handier than so much unground wheat. Yet will anybody say on this account that bread is a better thing than wheat? Suppose a man were going to some far country, where no corn grows, which would he take with him, bread or wheat? Suppose a sailor were thrown, with his family, on a desert island, which would he wish for, bread or wheat? Assuredly a single handful of wheat would be a greater God-send to the poor cast-away than a whole ship-load of bread. Why so? Because he could plant the wheat, and could not plant the bread. The bread after a time would get mouldy and be spoilt. The wheat, if it were sown, and proper care were taken of it, would grow, and flourish, and spread until large fields were covered with it: and generation after generation might be fed by the produce of the single handful. This is the great advantage which wheat has over bread. Bread may feed us for the moment, but when once eaten, it is gone for ever. Wheat, on the contrary, will bear seed: it will increase and multiply; after one crop has had its day, and been reaped, and stored in the barn, and consumed, another crop, provided seed be preserved, will spring up; and so long as the earth itself lasts, so long will corn last also. Thus too is it with rules and principles. A rule is like a loaf of bread. It is a ready, handy application of a principle; a principle made up for immediate use. By rules we govern or rule children. We say to them, 'Do this,' or, 'Don't do that:' because it is easy for them to understand a plain order; but it is not always easy to make them understand the principle or reason of it. When the child however comes to be a man, he puts away childish things. He wants a new set of rules adapted to his new state; for the rules of childhood he has outgrown, so that they no longer fit him. The rules which belong to one stage of life, are many of them ill-suited to other stages of life. In like manner the rules which belong to one class of men, or to one people, or to one age of the world, may not suit another class of men, or another people, or another age of the world. Hence different ages and different nations require different rules." ii. pp. 76—78.

We do not assert that every illiterate person could be easily made, even by this striking illustration, to understand clearly the difference between a principle and a precept; but the analogy is so happily conceived, and so well wrought out, that many who could not have embraced the distinction abstractedly, will be able to see something of its bearing by means of this similitude. And we should add, that in the illustration there is nothing mean; nothing that needs offend the most fastidious taste. It is simplicity of the best kind; arising, in the first place, from the eager desire of the preacher to impart to his hearers some valuable knowledge; and secondly, from the possession of powers which enable him to select the words and figures best suited to his purpose. It is much more than mere *plain preaching*. There is no great difficulty in making ourselves intelligible if we confine our discourse to topics which are most naturally discussed in words of every-day use. It is when abstract subjects are taken in hand, and distinctions are drawn, which it is important should not only be conceived for the moment, but be lodged in the mind as a part of its stock of knowledge, that the imaginative powers of the preacher come into play, and the resources of an active and highly cultivated mind turn to excellent account. To

bring a rude audience, living in the gross material world, gradually to look beyond it; to assist them by the help of their present stock of ideas to gather in more of an abstruser kind; and to fasten upon their memories some analogy between seen and unseen things that shall cling to them perhaps for life, is the triumph of the really successful teacher, and one which is well earned by much careful and laborious preparation. We do not say, indeed, that any study will enable a man of average powers to throw on every subject which he handles so strong and clear a light as that which emanates from a man gifted like the late Mr. Hare, and able to bring forth from God's treasury, with such admirable effect, things new and old; but if the attention of the clergy were more turned to this point, and a more constant effort were made by them to be thoroughly understood, and the responsibility of their position, *in this particular*, were more deeply felt, a simpler style of sermon-writing would be adopted, and much good of every kind would result from the change. Let our parochial ministers remember that they have before them, Sunday by Sunday, a body of persons, who, in the ordinary course of God's providence, will either be raised *by their teaching* to a higher world of thought and feeling; or else go to their graves as dull and gross, as full of prejudices on all subjects, and as scantily furnished with well-understood principles in morals and religion, as were the generations that sleep already around their churches. Let the attempt be made and persevered in, to throw the substance of that which they teach into every mind. Let the feelings of the poor be studied, their habits and associations taken into account, their whole mental furniture carefully examined *expressly with this object*, that what they do not know they may learn, and all that they have learnt may be made the means of communicating more. Let the writer descend for a time to their level, that he may bring them up again to his own; not by using quaint, and still less vulgar expressions; not so as to forsake his commanding position as a teacher of righteousness, or lose sight for an hour of his proper business, that of informing their minds with eternal, saving truth; but by doing that which every wise mother does in her earliest nursery lessons, namely, allowing for the scantiness of his people's vocabulary, and the limited range of their thoughts, and adapting himself to both in his endeavours to enlarge them.

The following extracts will serve to illustrate yet further our author's happy mode of conveying important information in language plain and familiar, perfectly grave, and generally suitable; we say generally, for we do not affirm that in his anxiety to convey his ideas, he never in any instance employs a word or image which, however expressive, (as for example in the illustration of a man's "rubbing and *scrubbing*" his hands over and over again, "after they have been washed quite 'clean'") conveys associations not quite adapted to "the dignity of the pulpit." The unlearned find nothing displeasing in such associations; and the really learned and judicious may forgive them, in consideration of their aptness, and for the sake of the object for which they are introduced; but there is a large class of persons, of almost all ranks, who have a vast dread of what they consider "vulgar;" while they have not the discrimination to distinguish between what is either really or affectedly coarse and offensive, and what is the

anxious condescension of an elegant, well-stored, and powerful mind, for the important purpose of illustrating or enforcing truth. It is of some moment that the case of these persons should not be overlooked in the attempt to familiarise pulpit ideom and imagery. We know, indeed, that we run some risk in using the abused phrase "the dignity of the pulpit." The Edinburgh Reviewers once said that the Church of England "will die of dignity;" and the Quarterly Review, in its remarks upon the very volumes before us, while commending Mr. Hare for "not flinching from expressions so natural and straightforward" as "tea and wheaten bread," and "every cottage in England *having its teapot*," adds, that some clergymen would have talked of the gratitude which our modern peasantry owe to God "for a fragrant beverage and farinaceous food;" and would have congratulated themselves, after this literary exploit, that though they had left the Wiltshire farmers and labourers in the dark as to what their preacher meant by the comforts for which they were to be grateful, he had at least not compromised "the dignity of the pulpit." But a caricature proves nothing. It does not follow that because the grandiloquence of the fragrant beverage was affected and absurd, that therefore every cottage having its own teapot is the best possible expression. The difficulty in such cases is to decide between two courses. If we use general expressions—such as, in this case, "better food, better clothing, and greater comforts"—we are merely allusive; we do not convey the intelligence of what these blessings really are to those who are ignorant on the subject, but only awaken ideas in the minds of those who are already in some measure informed; and the ideas when awakened are, after all, merely well-behaved abstractions, not individual warm-hearted friends. But if, on the contrary, we minutely specify, we are in danger of giving rise to combinations of thought not serious or edifying. In enumerating, for instance, the comforts and advantages which the poor man in these days has to be grateful for in consequence of the extension of trade, commerce, and manufactures, if we mention in so many words that every cottage has its own teapot, why not add—we do not write ludicrously, but only for illustration—and its own frying-pan; and a curtain to the bed or window; and some articles of crockery; and some knives and forks, and Britannia metal spoons; and clean printed cotton gowns or frocks, instead of the unwashable woollen garments of former days; and perhaps a watch instead of an hour-glass; and a Saturday Magazine, and, we had almost said, a composition doll for the children? Before a company of philosophers we should not be afraid to specify such articles; nor should we in ordinary conversation before a few simple cottagers, who would see nothing ludicrous in the enumeration; but in the pulpit such a catalogue would be out of place; because in a church, even in a country village, there is usually such an admixture of ranks that we could not answer for what unseemly associations would be excited, or that we should not cause a smile, instead of a devout feeling, at the mention of the teapot and so forth; the very solemnities of religion, especially in public worship, heightening by contrast the sense of the risible—that is to say, our own corrupt hearts being more apt to receive earthly things than spiritual, and our spiritual enemy, the devil, being ever on the watch to snatch away the seed, or to render it unfruitful; so that what would not be noticed at another time or in another place,

would disturb devotion, and excite vain imaginations in the house of God. To all this it must be added, that pulpit instruction is intended rather to impress principles which embrace all the varieties of human condition, than to apply them minutely to those varieties. The preacher inculcates honesty in all its details; but he does not apply those details specially to the case of the tailor, the dress-maker, the baker, the cook or footman, the sexton, the parish clerk, the lawyer, the apothecary, or the beer-shop keeper. It is not, however, because my lady's maid may say that the allusion to the teapot is "vulgar," but because it is too secular, that we think it "beneath the dignity of the pulpit;" just as it would be to remind a city audience to be grateful for the comfort of taxes being reduced, or the advantages of a railroad. It may be replied that all this indicates, not what the pulpit ought to be, but what it is; so that clergymen dare not come down to the level of their audience, but shoot over their heads. Now this is true, and sorrowfully do we admit it; but still there is a golden mean between extremes; and if we have uttered a caution which the Quarterly Reviewer thought superfluous, it is not because we are much concerned about an occasional word or image of Mr. Hare's, but because we dread the distortions of imitators, who, without a tithe of his talent or taste, might think they write like him by substituting coarseness for pedantry, and then fancying they were simple.

These things premised, we proceed with our extracts.

"But it may be well to go a little into particulars. The covetous man then, to begin with him, is an idolater. Of this there can be no doubt; for St. Paul expressly tells us, in his Epistle to the Colossians, (iii. 5), that covetousness, or, as the word may perhaps be more closely rendered, insatiableness and greediness, is idolatry; and again, in the Epistle to the Ephesians (v. 5.) the covetous man,—that is, the insatiable and greedy man, the man whom there is no satisfying,—is said to be an idolater. It matters little what the man is greedy of,—whether he is greedy of money, or whether he is greedy of business, or whether he is greedy of land, or whether he is greedy of meat or drink, or whether he is greedy of praise, and honour, and distinction,—if a man is greedy of any earthly thing, and does not know when he has had enough, and is ever longing and craving after it, and wishing to add more to more, the sentence is express against that man: St. Paul has declared him to be an idolater. The reason is plain. The covetous and greedy man has given that place in his heart to earthly things, which ought to be kept for heavenly things. Instead of considering the things of this world as mere necessaries, and setting the prime of his affections on things above, he looks on the former as the real good; whereas our Saviour has told us that there is none really good but one, that is, God. Perhaps however a man may say, What does it signify whether we look on the things of this life as necessaries and conveniences, or whether we deem them to be really goods? I answer, it signifies very much: for when we want anything, food, raiment, furniture, house, lands, simply because such things are necessary and convenient to us, it is easy to see there must be a limit to our want somewhere. Take food, for instance. If a man eats simply because it is necessary to eat, in order to support life, if he drinks only to satisfy his thirst, it is clear he will soon be satisfied. He will soon have eaten and drunk enough: and he will know when he has had enough, and will not wish for more. He will eat and drink to get rid of his hunger and thirst, just as he washes his face and hands to refresh himself and get rid of the dirt. No man, after his hands have been washed quite clean, goes on rubbing and scrubbing them over again: yet many a greedy man will go on eating and drinking after he has had his fill. Why so? Because greedy men, the glutton and the drunkard, take delight in eating and drinking, and do not take a like delight in washing. They wash, like rational beings, because it is necessary and wholesome and seemly; and so they wash enough, and no more. They eat and drink, not because it is necessary, but because they think it a good thing; they take a pleasure in it, and love it; and so they eat and drink to excess. For to that which is good, there is no limit in the

heart of man: of that we can never have enough. Here then is the great difference between seeking a thing, because it is necessary or useful to us, and desiring it as a real good. In the one case there is a limit to our wishes, in the other none. In the one case we have enough, when our needs are satisfied; in the other case we never have enough. We always wish, and crave, and pant, and hunger after more; and such craving and hungering is idolatrous. It is mistaking the creature for the Creator, and misapplying to a poor, unworthy, mean, and perishable thing, those infinite yearnings of the heart which belong of right to the Maker and Ruler of the universe."—Vol. II. p. 332—335.

"The lessons we are to draw from the histories of the Old Testament, are not of names and facts, but of laws and principles. We are to look on those histories, as shewing us the wires and springs by which God governs the world. That he does govern the world, that all the nations of the earth are subject to him, and that he allots prosperity to this nation, and calamity to that nation, as seems best to him, we know. But in most cases we cannot make out the hows and the wherefores of his dealings with them. We see that one nation is raised, and another lowered: but the reasons of God's ordinances, and the way in which he brings his will to pass, are mostly hidden from us. So that the history of most countries, may be likened to a great clock: we see the hands move, and hear the hours strike; but we cannot see and examine the works by which the hands are set in motion, and the hours are made to strike. With the history of the Jews, however, it is otherwise. In their case God has lifted up the veil, which mostly covers his dealings with mankind: he has shewn us the inside of the clock, and given us the means of observing how the wheels and pullies act upon the hands. In other words, he has set before us in the Bible, how entirely the welfare of a nation depends upon the piety and true religion of the people. There is no truth appertaining to what is called political wisdom, so useful, so important, so indispensable to be known and kept in mind. In the history of the Jewish people, we see this truth set forth, not once and again, but in every page. The sun does not ripen the wheat more regularly, or more constantly, than God's favour attends the Jews and prospers them, when they are steadfast to walk in his paths. Nor are weeds of all kinds more certain to spring up in a neglected piece of ground, than God's judgments to fall on the children of Israel, whenever their hearts are set on evil.

"I was comparing the world and its goings on to a clock. If a savage were to see a clock, and were not to be told that there are works which make it go, he would probably fancy it a live creature, or at any rate that the hands went of themselves. But after being shewn the works of any one clock, after some person had explained to him the uses of the wheels, and the pendulum, and the other parts, he would have no difficulty in making out that other clocks move on somewhat of the same principle: and he would never fall back into his former ignorant conceit, that the hands of any clock could go of their own accord. The mistake which I have supposed this ignorant savage to make about the going on of the clock, is the very same which the ignorant and irreligious are wont to make about the goings on of nations. They only see the outside of things. They will talk by the hour about the strength of armies, the size of fleets, the amount of revenues: they will tell you, that such a kingdom has done well, because it had this or that able man at its head; while such another kingdom has fallen into decay, because its manufactures have been neglected, and its trade managed upon unwise principles. Deeper than this the irreligious go not. They never look within, at the religious spirit and moral character of a people. Much less do they think of the great Clock-maker, who regulates all the nations of the earth, who alone can wind them up, and without whom they are sure to go down."—Vol. II. p. 37—39.

As far as our experience of village-preaching goes, it is commonly in a very different strain from this; not only less striking and interesting, but cast in quite a different mould, having much less of a business-like air about it, bespeaking the purpose of the preacher, apparently, rather to say *something* suitable to the occasion, and place, and subject, than to get into his hearers' minds, and to bring them, by God's help, to think and feel as he does. We cannot believe that such sermons as Mr. Hare's would be preached to the dullest congregation without being attentively listened to; while to many they would prove a weekly feast, at once adding to

their stores of spiritual knowledge, and bracing them afresh for their spiritual conflict. Without speaking less to the heart and conscience than most sermons that we read or hear, they appeal more to the understanding, and shew with what effect such an appeal may be made, even when very little information is assumed on the part of the hearers. While the persons addressed are those who are least capable of reasoning and least accustomed to it, they are spoken to as reasoning creatures, and are taught and helped to employ this excellent gift of God, for the highest ends, and on the noblest subjects.

Having made these discourses an apology for a few remarks upon pulpit compositions, it would be unjust to the memory of the writer if we did not add, that plainness of diction is not their only recommendation. The following extracts will shew how happily the great truths of the gospel are introduced, and how clear and forcible are the author's doctrinal statements.

"But some may say, 'If this be so, if we are naturally so given to evil, it cannot be our fault if we do wrong. It is our misfortune: we cannot help it: and God will never blame or punish us for not being better than he made us. You might as well blame a sick person for dying, as blame a man for sinning, if his nature is so corrupt and evil.' No doubt it would be very hard,—I have spoken a bold word; but St. Paul speaks as bold a one,—it would be very hard and unjust to punish men for what they cannot help. It would be very unjust to blame a sick man for dying, provided there were no physicians. But in a country where there are plenty of physicians, and the sick have only to send for them—if in such a country a sick man is obstinate, and will not send for a physician, and will not take the means of being made well, he is to blame; and, if he dies, he is guilty of his own death. Suppose now that the physician does not wait to be sent for, that he comes of his own accord to the sick man's bedside, that he brings a medicine of rare herbs in his hand, and says to the sick man, 'My friend, I heard you were very ill; and so I am come to see you. You certainly are very sick indeed, worse than you are aware of; for the fever gives you false spirits. Your disease is the leprosy; but it is a kind of leprosy, which, instead of breaking out openly, burns and dries up the inside. However, I have brought you a medicine, which will cure you, if you will take it. It is a medicine of rare herbs that comes from the Indies; and I have paid a great price for it. I cannot bear to see a fellow-creature so near death, without helping him. Never mind your poverty; I want no payment. I will give you the medicine freely, with all my heart, if you will only take it.' But the sick man refuses to take it. He does not like its look; or he tastes it, and finds it bitter, and will not swallow it; or he believes a neighbour, who tells him not to trust the physician, and that a glass of good wine is worth all the physic in the world. He will not take the physic; he drinks the wine instead; and the next morning he dies. Who is to blame?

"My brethren, this is our case. We have this leprosy. We cannot cure ourselves. But Jesus Christ is come to us, the great physician of the soul."—Vol. I. pp. 221—223.

"Mind, I am not saying that thrift and industry and friendliness are not good qualities. They are good, they are excellent qualities: and nobody can be a true Christian without them. But, excellent as they are, they are not spiritual qualities, and, when standing by themselves, can no more make a Christian, than wood without sails can make a ship. A plank of wood, you know, will float of itself, and, if large enough, will bear up a man who lays hold on it. So a person having those animal good qualities, which lie within the reach of the natural man, will float on the tide of this world, and, as the phrase is, will keep his head above water. But would you prepare for the voyage which you must all undertake? would you speed toward the haven, where we shall all one day wish to be? Mere wood will not serve: you must get sails. To the virtues of this world, you must add the feelings of another world. To the animal good qualities, which, as animals, we have in common with the gentler and more social of the brutes, you must add those spiritual graces, which raise man to a brotherhood with the angels. This is the one thing especially needful; which yet no man can do for himself. No man can say, 'I will love God.' No man can say, 'I will grieve for having offended God by my coldness and negligence in

his service.' These feelings are no longer natural to us: we lost them at the Fall; and ever since, a man can no more bid them spring up in his heart, than the hull of a ship can fit itself out for sea, and wing itself with sails for starting."—Vol. II. pp. 96, 97.

The following are specimens of our Author's practical exhortations:—

"Conceive a revengeful, unforgiving man, repeating this prayer," (the Lord's prayer,) "which you all, I hope, repeat daily,—conceive a man, with a heart full of wrath against his neighbour, with a memory which treasures up the little wrongs and insults and provocations he fancies himself to have received from that neighbour, conceive such a man, praying to God most High, to forgive him his trespasses, as he forgives the man who has trespast against him. What in the mouth of such a man do these words mean? They mean . . . . but that you may more fully understand their meaning, I will turn them into a prayer, which we will call the prayer of the unforgiving man: 'O God, I have sinned against thee many times, from my youth up until now. I have often been forgetful of thy goodness: I have not duly thanked thee for thy mercies: I have neglected thy service: I have broken thy laws: I have done many things utterly wrong against thee. All this I know: and beside this, doubtless I have committed many secret sins, which in my blindness I have failed to notice. Such is my guiltiness, O Lord, in thy sight: deal with me, I beseech thee, even as I deal with my neighbour. He has not offended me one-tenth, one-hundredth part as much as I have offended thee: but he has offended me very grievously; and I cannot forgive him. Deal with me, I beseech thee, O Lord, as I deal with him. He has been very ungrateful to me,—though not a tenth, not a hundredth part as ungrateful as I have been to thee: yet I cannot overlook such base and shameful ingratitude. Deal with me, I beseech thee, O Lord, as I deal with him. I remember and treasure up every little trifle, which shews how ill he has behaved to me. Deal with me, I beseech thee, O Lord, as I deal with him. I am determined to take the very first opportunity of doing him an ill turn. Deal with me, I beseech thee, O Lord, as I deal with him.' Can anything be more shocking and horrible than such a prayer? Is not the very sound of it enough to make one's blood run cold? Yet this is just the prayer which the unforgiving man offers up every time he repeats the Lord's prayer." Vol. II. pp. 292, 3.

"We are to pray, and to strive, that God's will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven. That is, we are to do it, as the angels do it, wholly, readily, cheerfully, and out of the love of God. We are to do it wholly; for who can fancy an angel leaving any part of his errand unperformed? We are to do it readily; for they are winged messengers, and run swift as thought to do God's bidding. We are to do it cheerfully, and with the hearts of angels, which are the abodes of joy and gladness.

"The mere doing God's will is little. The devils themselves, we may be sure, will be constrained to go as far as that. Only, while the angels do it with joy, and find all their happiness in doing it, the evil spirits do it unwillingly, and would fain shake it off if they could. So that, unless we bring our hearts to do God's will cheerfully, we cannot be said to do it as the angels do it, we cannot be said to do it as it is done in heaven. Above all we must do it out of the love of God, for his glory, and not for our own. Glory to God in the highest, was the song of the angels at our Saviour's birth. The glory of God then is their great object; the love of God is their chief motive. It is only by the union of love with duty that the will of God can be done as it is in heaven, where he rules in the sight of all, and issues his commands as it seems good to his eternal wisdom. The angels leave their places before the sapphire throne at God's bidding. They are his servants, and run to and fro whithersoever he sends them: and they go joyfully, deeming it a blessing to be charged with the least of his commands. Have we any thing of this feeling about us? Do not say that it is above the measure of earth, that flesh and blood cannot know it. Many a good soldier has felt in this manner toward a great and beloved commander: many a loyal subject has so felt toward his king. And is not God our king? Is not the Captain of our salvation our commander? Let us feel toward him as his subjects and soldiers, happy to be employed by him, ready to obey him, active in his service, but at the same time prepared to endure hardships, to stand still at our post, to bear the taunts and reproaches of the enemy, whenever he orders us to do so. I once read a story of a great captain, who after a battle was talking over the events of the day with his officers. He asked them who had done best that day. Some mentioned one man who had fought very bravely, some another. 'No (said he)

you are all mistaken: the best man in field to-day was a soldier, who had his arm lifted up against an enemy, but who, on hearing the trumpet sound a retreat, checked himself, and dropt his arm without striking the blow. That perfect and ready obedience to the will of his general is the noblest thing that has been done to-day.' Think over this story, my brethren; endeavour to obey God in all things, as that soldier obeyed his general; and you will find out in time what our Saviour meant by commanding us to pray that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven." —Vol. II. pp. 251—253.

We will throw together for our concluding extracts a few more of our author's illustrations, which it will be seen are striking, original, redolent of genius, and introduced to give clearness or force to the preacher's argument. The question will of course recur whether a horse in a garden, or an ill-behaved man walking over a strawberry bed, or a gallop over Salisbury Plain, are consistent with pulpit dignity; to which our only answer is, that whatever may be the conventional rules of modern preaching, such illustrations, if used in simplicity and godly sincerity, would not be judged of harshly by Him who discoursed on a figtree, or a falling tower, or on catching fish, or on a runaway from his father's house seeking to satisfy his hunger with the husks which the swine did eat. We have no doubt that the earnest manly simplicity of the writer of these discourses made the horse in the garden, and the other familiar images, appear so natural and forcible that no one thought of smiling at them.

"But if we are to reverence God's name, and not to profane it, because it is the name of God Most High—if we are to keep the Sabbath-day holy, and not to profane it, because it is the day which the Lord has hallowed,—we may be sure the principle does not stop here. Every thing else which God has in any way set apart for his own, and put his mark on,—every thing else which in any way belongs more peculiarly to him,—his word, his ordinances, his house, his people,—all these, you will see after a moment's thought, come under the same rule.

"They are all things which God has cleansed: therefore we must not call them common. He has set them apart for his own service: he has fenced them off, as it were, from the waste of the world, and has enclosed them for his own use. Hence there is the same sort of difference between them and all merely worldly and common things, as there is 'between a garden and Salisbury Plain.'

"No one who knows how to behave himself, would bring a horse into a garden, or walk over the strawberry beds, or trample down the flowers. But in riding from here to Salisbury every body would feel himself at liberty, while crossing the downs, to gallop over the turf at pleasure. Well! the same difference which there is between common down and a cultivated garden, the same is there also between worldly days, worldly books, worldly names, worldly people, and God's day, God's book, God's name, and God's people. The former are common, and may be treated as such: the latter are not common, because God has taken them to himself, and brought them within the limits of his sanctuary, and thrown the safeguard of his holiness around them. In a word, they belong to God, and therefore are not to be treated as if they belonged to man." Vol. II. pp. 342, 343.

"It is a day for the poor to rest from the work of their hands: it is a day for the rich to rest from the work of their heads, from the anxieties of worldly thoughts, from the troubles and cares of business. Only too many of them will not enter into this rest. They have been walking so long through the rough places of the earth, that, when they come home, the mud is sticking to their shoes, and the burs and brambles to their clothes; and they have grown so used to them, that they feel quite uncomfortable if they are taken off.

"So besotted are many persons with the love of the world, that, instead of flinging all its cares away from them, in order that they may enjoy the blessed rest of the Sunday, they set apart their Sunday for looking over and casting up their accounts. Though they cannot blow or stir the fire in Mammon's furnace, they are determined at all events to snuff in its smoke." Vol. II. p. 355.

"How often do we see the sinner, perched on the dunghill of his vices, clapping his wings in self-applause, and

fancying himself a much grander creature than the poor Christian, who all the while is soaring on high like a lark, and mounting on his way to Heaven." Vol. I. p. 27.

"I began by saying that the religion of Jesus Christ is altogether a practical thing. This is the first and simplest and main reason why we are to learn it practically. Just consider how we are taught anything else that is practical; how a child, for instance, is taught to read. Is it by hearing about reading, or by being read to? A child might hear about reading, and might hear reading, all its life long; and, were this all, it would never be able to tell one letter from another. It can only learn to read by trying to read. It must begin by learning its letters; when it knows its letters thoroughly, it must learn to put them together, first in short words or syllables, and afterward in longer words: and lastly, it must learn to put the words together, and to read them as they follow one another in the book. The same holds of everything else that is practical: whatever it may be, it must be learnt by practice. It is not by hearing or reading about making shoes, that a man becomes a shoemaker, but by trying to make them. Above all is this true of that which is the most practical of all things, the religion of Christ." Vol. I. pp. 96, 97.

"In the first dangerous illness I had after I was grown up, I was forced to keep my bed for a week or more. While I did so, I was not aware how feeble I had become. But when I tried to get up, and could not so much as put on my clothes without help, I found out my own weakness. Just so is it with the sinner. So long as he is sick unto death, so long as he lives dead and almost buried in his sins, so long does he continue in ignorance of his true state. He dreams in his heart, 'There is not much the matter with me; I shall easily get well, and have little need of a physician.' Thus he dreams till God sends something to rouse him from his deadly slumber. Some great disappointment teaches him the vanity of all earthly plans; or some affliction pierces and startles him. The man opens his eyes, and sees the wrath of God hanging like a drawn sword over him. In his fright he perhaps tries to get up. Get up! He can no more get up, and quit his evil habits, than I could get up from my sick bed after my illness. Back he falls, after finding out his own weakness, which before he had no suspicion of; and there he lies, in the wickedness which he is now conscious and afraid of, but which he feels he has not strength to forsake." Vol. I pp. 104-5.

"To sanctify or hallow a thing, is to set it apart for God's service. Thus the Bible is holy, because it is God's book; and the first day of the week is holy, because it is the Lord's day; and a church is holy, because it is God's house. Thus Christians too are called in Scripture the holy, and the saints, because they are God's people. So, when we say that it is God's will we should be sanctified or hallowed, this is the same as saying that our hearts ought to be like a church. Now consider what is necessary to make our hearts like a church. One thing necessary for that purpose is, that they should be full of prayer. A church is a house of prayer: and our hearts cannot be like churches till they are full of prayer also. Again, a church is the appointed place for reading and explaining the word of God: and our hearts must resemble it in this too: the word of God must be the food of our minds, the delight and meditation of our hearts. Moreover, a church is the last place where any man would think of doing any wicked, any unjust, any unclean thing: so should it be with the heart of a Christian. It must not be a den of thieves, nor a hiding-place for foul vermin. Above all, a church is devoted to God. This is the great mark of the Christian; he should be devoted, heart and mind, body and soul, he should be given up altogether to God's service. He is not indeed to be always praying, nor always reading the Scriptures; but he is to be always serving God." Vol. I. pp. 135-6.

We are far from being surprised that these volumes have already obtained a wide circulation. All may read them with profit, but to clergymen, if studied with discretion, they may prove serviceable in no common degree; in regard especially to the lucid clearness of their style, their copiousness of appropriate and striking illustration, their ease and *naturalness* of manner, (to use a word which ought to be coined, if it be not already stamped and current), their tone of earnest and fatherly affection, and above all, the admirable skill with which abundant intellectual resources

are adapted to the capacities of an unlearned audience.

In perusing these discourses, the reflection has often recurred to us, that amidst all that may look dark and gloomy in the prospects of our national church, there is something exceedingly comforting and satisfactory in the thought that men of this stamp are labouring with such ability and faithfulness in many of the secluded parishes and hamlets of the country; men unknown to fame, and careless of human praise, and yet consecrating to God talents which would enable them to compete with the foremost in the race of honour. To not a few, probably, of our readers, the name and character of Augustus Hare are well known; Oxford reckoned him among her ornaments; and by an extended circle of private friends he was honoured and beloved; but as a devoted Christian pastor, and a most accomplished and effective preacher, these posthumous volumes have for the first time introduced him to public notice. We rejoice then to think that there are many such men, of whom the world knows nothing, and who are content that it should never hear their names; but whose record is on high, and who are building up an enduring monument in the hearts of an attached and grateful flock.

Every now and then we hear of such persons, and learn that our church, built upon the Rock of ages, and upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the corner-stone, tottering as some deem it, has many pillars to support it which are not seen from a distance, and yet are contributing, under God, most important aid to its stability and strength. Our travels bring us into some unexplored district, or our friends tell us of their own or a neighbouring parish, in which such men are found; and the report which we hear of them proves that they are faithful witnesses for God, expounding both with their lips, and by their lives, the holy gospel committed to their trust. Hence we thank God and take courage. We read not in the growing numbers of such champions of the truth the signs of a falling church, or a symptom that God is about to remove the candlestick from us. On the contrary, we see reason to believe that Christ's spiritual kingdom is on the advance; and as a set-off against the bold front and closely compacted ranks of the men who wish us ill, we call to mind the daily blessing that is won for us, from ten thousand cottage hearths, by the continuous, noiseless, yet most effective, labours of the best of our parochial clergy.

And here we may further remark, What a debt of gratitude is due to the church which trains such men for their work, and spreads them through our towns and villages and hamlets. What other system that has yet been tried could give to two little villages, each with less than two hundred souls, three-fourths of their inhabitants in all probability being common labourers, the residence, the services, the head and heart, we may say, of a pastor, furnished as our author was, and labouring as he did, to bring up his rustic hearers to intellectual and Christian manhood? Here is *the man of enlarged philosophical mind* dealing with babes in knowledge;—the *ripe scholar* drawing upon the resources with which observation and study have enriched his own mind to store with new materials for thought those of the ploughman or mechanic;—the *preacher, powerful to convince and persuade,* discoursing to an unlettered audience of

things divine, in a style which they know not to be eloquence, but which yet they feel to be weighty and affecting;—*the sound theologian* seeking to convey to men of few words and small capacity all that they need to know and believe to their souls' health; *the accomplished gentleman*, (we speak only from conjecture, and yet with unhesitating confidence), whose presence would be welcomed in the most polished circles, making himself the friend and companion of the poor, and contented to live where perhaps he must travel many a mile before he can find a congenial mind, because there the Lord of the vineyard has planted him, and there, though the spot seem rude and cheerless, he can find full employment for all his energies. The sight is one to make the eye glisten and the heart glow; it shows a brother in one of the most attractive lights in which human nature can be seen; it seems to present as near an approach to the ministry of superior beings about ourselves as our weakness can ever attain to; and for the Church of England we claim the credit of equipping, supporting, and locating many such worthy sons in our country parishes. Who shall supply their place if rash hands should lay low our time-honoured institutions, or our legislature should in an evil hour adopt the modern paradox that Christianity will be best propagated by abolishing all national provision for its support? We do not fear that, under any circumstances, there would be a lack of piety and talent in the service of the sanctuary; but we do fear that our villages would suffer, that thousands almost of secluded districts would be visited by an utter famine of the word of God, or that the superior attractions of large towns would draw off from the places, where some of them are most wanted, all the men of first-rate pretensions, and leave our rural population to the ignorance, narrow-mindedness, and frequent fanaticism of the lowest class of self-appointed teachers. May God in his mercy avert from us such an evil! and as the likeliest means that we can see or conceive of for keeping it far away, may He preserve and purify our National Church, give wisdom to her rulers, increase and multiply his gifts upon all her clergy, and make her a yet more faithful witness to the truth, and a yet more efficient and bountiful dispenser of the word of life to the millions of our countrymen.

Yet, one word more; if any young clergyman, in a retired rural parish, is tempted to think that he has not a field of ministerial exertion wide enough for his diligence, or in which his talents can be duly appreciated, let him open such discourses as those of Heber at Hodnet, or Hare at Alton Barnes (not to mention living names), and see how men, whom he will probably acknowledge to be far his superiors in ability and acquirement, have not only been contented, but rejoiced, to devote all the energies of their gifted minds to the instruction and guidance of a small and simple village flock. If his sphere of labour be in a remote and confined nook of his Lord's vineyard, to spend all his talents in cultivating it to the utmost of his power is not only his duty as a Christian minister, but will bring him a rich return, probably in this world, surely in the next. We were much impressed by a passage in the late charge of the excellent and indefatigable Bishop of Winchester, who tells those of his clergy who might feel disheartened at being placed in very

small rustic parishes, that at the last day they will not complain they had too few souls committed to their charge to give an account of; neither, we may add, will they have to confess among their sins that their discourses were too plain, affectionate, or probing; or too full of Christ—of his love, his atonement, his promises, and the debt of gratitude we owe to live to his glory.

OBITUARY.

THE REV. DR. MARSHMAN.

(Concluded from p. 407.)

"Dr. Carey, who had been employed for six years in India, in the new and untried field of Missionary labours, while his future colleague was completing his studies at Bristol, had requested the Baptist Missionary Society, of which Dr. Ryland was one of the founders, to send more labourers into the vineyard. Dr. Ryland proposed the subject to his pupil, and found that it was not altogether new to his mind, as the perusal of the periodical accounts of the mission had begun to kindle in his mind an anxiety for India. He was accepted by the Society, then in its infancy, as a missionary; and embarked with Mr. Grant, one of his own pupils, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Brunsdon, in the Criterion, an American vessel. They arrived in the Ganges in October; and intending to proceed to Mudnabatty to join Dr. Carey, were advised to take up their abode temporarily at Serampore, where they landed on the 13th October, 1799. It was about this time that the fear of an invasion of India by the French predominated in the counsels of India; several French emissaries in the guise of priests having been detected about the country. In announcing the arrival of Dr. Marshman and his associates, the printer of one of the Calcutta papers, who had never heard of the existence of a Baptist denomination, set forth that four Papist missionaries had arrived in a foreign ship, and proceeded up to a foreign settlement. The paragraph could not fail to catch Lord Wellesley's eye. The captain was instantly summoned to the police, and informed that his ship would be refused a port clearance, unless he engaged to take back the Papist missionaries. He explained the mistake, and in one respect removed the fears of Government; but there was so strong a disposition manifested to obstruct missionary operations, upon the plea of their dangerous tendency, that the missionaries found they could not reside with any confidence in the British territories, and that it was wise to accept of the countenance and protection which was so generously offered them by the Danish authorities. Dr. Carey felt the full force of their arguments, and soon after came down to join them;—and thus commenced the Serampore mission.

"Three congenial minds were thus brought together by the appointment of Providence, and they lost no time in laying a broad basis for their future operations. They threw their whole souls into the noble enterprise which demanded all their courage and zeal, since, from the British Government they had nothing but the sternest opposition to expect the moment the extension and the success of their labours should bring them into public notice. The resources of the Society were totally inadequate to the support of all the Missionary families now in the field. Indeed, Dr. Marshman and his associates had come out with the distinct understanding that they were to receive support only till they could support themselves. They immediately began to open independent sources of income. Dr. Carey obtained the post of professor in the college of Fort William, then recently established. Dr. and Mrs. Marshman opened a boarding school; and Mr. Ward established a printing office, and laboured with his own hands in setting the types of the first edition of the Bengalee New Testament, which Dr. Carey had brought with him. Dr. Carey's motto, "Expect great things, attempt great things" became the watch-word of the three. They determined, by a noble sacrifice of individual interests and comforts, to live as one family, and to throw their united income into one joint stock, to be devoted to the common cause. Merging all minor differences of opinion in a sacred anxiety for the promotion of the great enterprize which absorbed their minds, they made a combined movement for the diffusion of truth and knowledge in India. To the hostility of government, and to every discouragement which arose from the nature of the undertaking, they opposed a spirit

of Christian meekness and calm perseverance. They stood in the front of the battle of Indian missions! and during the arduous struggle, which terminated with the charter of 1813, in granting missionaries free access to India, they never for a moment deserted their post, or despaired of success. When, at a subsequent period, Lord Hastings, who honoured them with his kind support, had occasion to revert in conversation to the severe conflict they had passed through, he assured them that, in his opinion, the freedom of resort to India which missionaries then enjoyed, was owing, under God, to the prudence, the zeal, and the wisdom which they had manifested, when the whole weight of government in England and India was directed to the extinction of the missionary enterprize.

"It would be impossible, within the limits to which we must confine ourselves, to enumerate the plans which they formed for the mission, for translations of the Sacred Scriptures, and for education; or the obstacles which tried the strength of their principles. Neither is it possible to individualize Dr. Marshman's efforts in every case; for, so complete was the unity of their designs, that it seemed as if three great souls had been united in one, so as to have but one object, and to be imbued with one impulse. But with this unity of design, there was necessarily a division of labour; and we may briefly state, therefore, the particular objects which engaged Dr. Marshman's time and attention. In 1806 he applied himself diligently to the study of the Chinese language, and was enabled to publish a translation of the entire Scriptures, and a grammar in that tongue. The Loll Bazar chapel, erected at a time when the means of religious instruction in Calcutta were small, and when religious feeling was at so low an ebb that even Martyn could not command on an evening a congregation of more than twenty, was mainly indebted for its existence to Dr. Marshman's personal efforts. When the erection of it was suspended for lack of funds, he went about from house to house raising subscriptions for it; and for his pains was exhibited in masquerade, at an entertainment given to Lord Minto, as a 'Pious Missionary, begging subscriptions.' To him the Benevolent Institution in Calcutta was indebted for its birth and subsequent vigour. The idea of it was struck out when Dr. Leyden, Dr. Marshman, and Dr. Hare were dining together; and the prospectus drawn up by Dr. Marshman, was carefully revised by Dr. Leyden. He continued to act as secretary to the institution to the last moment in which his health permitted him to act. He was also associated with Dr. Carey in the translation of the Ramayun into English, of which three volumes were published. To the plan of native schools, he gave up much time and labour; and the valuable "Hints" which he published in the form of a pamphlet, just at the time when the first efforts were made for education in India, twenty-one years ago, was deemed worthy of being incorporated with one of the leading publications in England.

"In 1826 he revisited England, after an absence of twenty-seven years, and travelled through the United Kingdom, endeavouring, by his public addresses and in private conversation, to urge on the cause of missions; and there are many now in India, to whom this notice will recall, with a melancholy pleasure, the warmth and animation which he was the means of communicating to their minds on that subject. He visited Denmark, and was graciously received by his majesty Frederick the Sixth, to whose steady and uninterrupted protection, the mission may be said to have been indebted for its existence, when assailed by the British government. His majesty was pleased to grant a charter of Incorporation to Serampore College, upon Dr. Marshman's petition. He returned to Serampore in May, 1829, and joined Dr. Carey and his associates in superintending the mission under the new form of an independent association, which it had acquired. In June, 1834, he was deprived of this venerable friend and colleague, with whom he had been permitted to act for thirty-five years. He bore the separation with more firmness than was expected; but the dissolution of such a union, cemented by the noblest of all undertakings, and sanctified by time, made a deep and visible impression on his mind. All the veneration and affection of his younger associates could not fill up the void created by the loss of Dr. Carey. He appeared among us as the solitary relic of a past age of great men. The activity of his mind, however, though with occasional interruptions, continued, till the mind itself appeared to be worn out. The calamity which befel his daughter, Mrs. Havelock, at Landour, in October last year, produced a severe shock to his feelings, which, added to increasing infirmities, brought him gradually lower and lower. About six weeks before his death, he was taken out on the river by the advice of Dr. Nicholson and Dr. Voigt, but his constitution was exhausted. Yet when the excitement of

this short excursion, which was extended to Fort Gloster, had given him a small return of strength, both bodily and mental, the energy of former days seemed again to come over him, and he passed several days in arranging plans of usefulness, the accomplishment of which would have required years. At length, on Tuesday, the 5th of December, he gently sunk to rest, without pain or sorrow, in the lively enjoyment of that hope which is full of immortality.

"His form was tall and athletic. His constitution appeared to be constructed of iron. He exposed himself to all the severities of an Indian climate, with perfect impunity. He enjoyed, till within the last year of his life, such uninterrupted health, as falls to the lot of few in India. During thirty-seven years he had not taken medicine to the value of ten Rupees. The strength of his body seemed to be admirably adapted with the structure of his mind, to fit him for the long career of usefulness he was permitted to run. He was peculiarly remarkable for ceaseless industry. He usually rose at four, and despatched half the business of the day before breakfast. When extraordinary exertions appeared necessary, he seemed to have a perfect command over sleep, and has been known for days together to take less than half his usual quantity of rest. His memory was great beyond that of most men. He recalled facts, with all their minute associations, with the utmost facility. This faculty he enjoyed to the last day of his existence. During the last month of his life, when unable even to turn on his couch without assistance, he dictated to his daughter, Mrs. Voigt, his recollections of the early establishment of the Mission at Serampore, with a clearness and minuteness perfectly astonishing. The vast stores of knowledge which he had laid up in early life, and to which he was making constant addition, rendered his personal intercourse in society a great enjoyment. His manners and deportment, particularly towards his inferiors, were remarkable for amenity and humility. To his family he was devoted almost to a fault, so that his enemies found in this subject a fertile field for crimination—with what generosity of feeling let every parent judge. During a union of more than forty-six years, he was the most devoted of husbands, and as the father of a family of twelve children, of whom only six lived to an age to appreciate his worth, and only five survived to deplore his loss, he was the most affectionate of parents.

"The leading trait of his character, more especially in the earlier part of his career, was energy and firmness. This, combined with a spirit of strong perseverance, enabled him to assist in carrying out into effect those large views which he and his colleagues delighted to indulge in. His piety was deep and genuine. His religious sentiments were without bigotry. But the most distinguishing feature in his life, was his ardent zeal for the cause of Missions. This zeal never for a moment suffered any abatement, but seemed to gather strength from every new difficulty. The *precious* cause, as he latterly denominated it, occupied his dying thoughts as it had occupied his living exertions; and the last question which he asked of those around him was, 'Can you think of any thing I can yet do for it?' This zeal was united with a degree of pecuniary disinterestedness which has seldom been surpassed. He considered it his greatest privilege that God had enabled him to lay on the altar of his cause so large a contribution from his own labours. With the means of amassing an ample fortune, he did not leave behind him, of all his own earnings in India for thirty-eight years, more than the amount of a single year's income of his seminary in its palmy days."

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

An arrangement having been made, in consequence of the coronation, to publish the July number of all the periodical works on the 26th of June, we can only anticipate, not describe, on the day on which we are writing, (June 22) the solemnities of that august spectacle. It is not in the view of a Christian Observer a mere gorgeous national pageant, though, like all other earthly scenes of glory, "it passeth away;" but it conveys many important lessons, which the nation will do well seriously to consider. We hope, before we lay down our pen, to advert to some of these heads of instruction; but we will first briefly notice a few of the memoranda of the month.

The hope which was held out of some respite to the agitations of Ireland by the willingness of Sir. R. Peel and his friends to meet her Majesty's ministers in some amicable arrangement respecting the Municipal Bill, and other liti-

gated Irish questions, seems to be frustrated. Sir Robert Peel agreed to grant new municipal corporations, instead of merely abolishing the old ones, on the ground that public opinion is in favour of such a measure; and Lord John Russell agreed to give up the appropriation principle in the Irish Tithe bill, on the ground that public opinion is against that measure: though each adhering to his old opinion; Sir R. Peel, that the new corporations will not be favourable to the Protestant church; and Lord J. Russell, that the appropriation scheme is just and wise. The armistice has been broken by the determination of the Cabinet, apparently from fear of Mr. O'Connell, not to take a real ten-pound value of municipal qualification, as Sir R. Peel agreed to; but either to have a shuffling estimate of value, as in the Irish elective franchise, by which five pounds may be sworn to be worth ten; or if a real estimate is applied, through the intended rating for the poor, then to make the qualification five pounds instead of ten. The conduct of the cabinet in this matter has been exceedingly reprehensible. All that Sir R. Peel asked for, was that the qualification assigned in the bill should be bonâ-fide to the amount specified; whereas Lord John Russell means that £10 shall not be £10; or that if it be, then to substitute five for it.

The Anti-plurality Bill has gone up to the House of Lords, where some considerable amendments are likely to be proposed. To some details of the bill we see strong objections; and we also continue to lament that, instead of merely restricting pluralities by value, population, and distance, it does not abolish them; for this it might do, at least in principle, or prospectively, making provision for temporary circumstances; but laying at once a solid foundation which would not require to be laid again; whereas now, though the restraints in the bill will prevent much evil, the germ of the old system remains, and adequate efforts will not be made to unite or divide parishes, and to procure aid to poor livings, so as to abolish all plea for pluralities. Not that the plea is worth much; for it is not, for the most part, the poorer benefices which are held in plurality: besides which, many bishops have discouraged pluralities, and some have never made a pluralist from their own patronage: and yet no inconvenience has been stated to have arisen, nor has there been any dearth of suitable candidates for the less valuable preferments. A bill, grounded on a principle, and which eventually, even though remotely, will work out that principle to its due effects, is worth twenty bills of much larger immediate details, which do not go to the root of the question. See Mr. Hare's admirable illustration of this doctrine at p. 456 of our present Number.

Mr. Plumptre's bill for preventing Sunday trading, notwithstanding its very moderate character, has been harshly and unfairly used in the debates in the committee; and we regret to say that her Majesty's Solicitor-General, who, from his office, ought to be on the side of public morals, is among its most strenuous opponents. The old friends of the measure have conscientiously and ably defended it; but the great body of Conservatives, as well as their political adversaries, have shown either apathy, or secret dislike, by keeping aloof from the discussions. There is a general heartlessness among our political men of all parties on such questions, which, if we believe the Bible to be an inspired book, does not augur well for the best interests of the country. A strong expression of public opinion will however do much to counteract the baneful effects of the moral apathy of the House of Commons; as we have lately seen in the case of the Hippodrome bill, which has not yet been carried up to the House of Lords, and we trust never will be, in consequence of the strong impression made upon the country by the discussion of the question; without which the House of Lords, however much inclined to watch over such matters, might have passed the bill in ignorance of its exceptionable character. We earnestly wish to see public attention in like manner attracted to an official statement just made by her Majesty's government that it is their intention to procure a law that no rail-road shall be closed against the conveyance of the mail on the Lord's day; though the proprietors should have conscientiously closed it against their own business. We admit the difficulties of the case; for having nationally broken God's law in devoting his holy day to mail-coach travelling, we must either go back or go forward; if we do not cease from the sacrilegious oppression of depriving of their Sabbath the tens of thousands of persons who are concerned in receiving, transmitting, and delivering letters, we must extend it, by either forcing railway proprietors, however unwillingly, to allow their lines to be opened on the Lord's-day; or by providing some substitute, which is affirmed to be

impracticable, and certainly would not be less a breach of the Sabbath. The whole difficulty arises out of the first sin; yet this is pleaded in excuse for all the rest, just as a man indicted for some grievous crime, pleads that he was intoxicated.

Lord Brougham has relinquished his Bill for the abolition of the West Indian apprenticeship on the first of next August; but we rejoice to say that the legislatures of Nevis, Tortola, Montserrat, and Barbadoes, have themselves most wisely anticipated the measure; and we doubt not their example will be followed in most, if not all, the other islands; and that in any case there will be a repression of the injustice and cruelty which have awakened so overwhelming an outburst of displeasure and indignation in the mother country. But we still retain our old opinion that the West Indies will do no more than force, or fear, or policy, exacts from them; and that all the energies of England will continue to be needed to protect the late servile population under the new as well as the old system. Their intellectual, moral, and spiritual improvement has been very great; the prospect is most hopeful; the fields are white to the harvest; but even yet the labourers are comparatively few, and the prayers and exertions of British Christians are urgently required to augment their numbers.

In reply to the well-timed remonstrances of the Bishop of London, Lord Melbourne has stated that the Queen's government is in correspondence with the East India company upon the subject of the coerced attendance of her Majesty's Christian subjects at the abominably licentious and cruel rites of Pagan idolatry. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has also remonstrated on the subject; Mr. Poynder has again brought the question before the court of proprietors, with a new collection of disgraceful facts; and petitions, and memorials are flowing in to both houses of parliament, and to the court of directors; who, we trust, will now be forced to listen to the voice of a Christian nation, and to abolish forthwith and for ever these ungodly practices.

Mr. Wyse (a Roman Catholic) has strongly urged his motion for the appointment of a public Board of Education; but was outvoted by a slight majority, the friends of the measure being active and at their posts, but the great majority of the members, either from indifference or design, absenting themselves from the discussion. Lord John Russell opposed the motion; not however from principle, but only on the ground of its being inexpedient at the present moment; and he confesses that he cannot see his way to any plan of national education which is likely to give general satisfaction. So far we have a respite; but it behoves the friends of religious education to be vigilant and active, for the secularists are urging their scheme with great zeal and plausibility, and not without sanguine hopes of final success. The deplorable fanaticism exhibited by a band of Kentish peasants under the instigation of the lunatic Thom, under the name of Courtenay, and which has been attended with a lamentable loss of life, has been urged in proof of the need of education. Now, we do not deny this need; it is fearfully great both as respects the quality and the quantity of popular instruction: but we deny that the schemes now proposed will remedy the evil. Thom's deluded followers were incited by alleged political grievances and oppressions; and as to their fanaticism, it was not the absence of secular knowledge, but of scriptural, that made them listen to the fallacious cry of "Lo, here is Christ!" The remedy which some of our theorists are proposing for fanaticism is infidelity; but the true remedy is solid religion; and as for the scenes of bloodshed, let the atrocities of the first French Revolution declare whether Deism and Atheism soften and purify the human heart. The fanaticism of these peasants is not so extraordinary as the mental follies of some "useful knowledge" men, who can believe animal magnetism, and other absurdities, provided they are not revealed in the Bible.

We had penned some animadversions on the New Zealand Bill; but they are happily superflous, as the Bill has been rejected.

Afflicting intelligence has arrived from Zoolu of the massacre of a large number of the White settlers by that African Nero, Dingarn, and of the abandonment, we trust only temporary, of the settlement of Natal and the infant Mission under Captain Gardiner and the Rev. Mr. Owen. As the accounts are at present imperfect, we forbear any remark till the whole history of the matter is better known.

We have not space left for our proposed remarks on the Coronation; but the subject is not temporary, though

the ceremonial is so; and it may even be considered with more advantage after the excitement has passed away, than during its continuance. The religious character of the solemnity; its recognition of that slighted truth, "By ME (saith the Lord) kings reign;" the Queen's oath; the people's homage; our civil privileges and duties; all suggest admonitions of great moment, especially in these our days, when so many maxims of Inspired Wisdom are too often regarded as obsolete. We discern some clouds in the horizon, which this moment of national delight and gratitude may not be the most favourable time for noticing. Let us rejoice, and rejoice heartily and loyally; but when we remember the tender age of our beloved Queen; the many dangers and temptations which surround her; the seductive influence of pomp, flattery, and frivolous pleasures; the jealous eye with which the proceedings of a court are watched; and many other circumstances; we cannot say that our joy should not be mixed with some trembling, and with many prayers. The prayers in our Liturgy are peculiarly appropriate; and for our duties, we need only refer to such passages as 1 Peter ii. 13—17; Titus iii. 1. In fine, let us remember with gratitude our great national mercies, and celebrate this public festival in the spirit of the servants of God of old, as described 1 Kings viii. 66, when "They blessed the king, and went unto their tents joyful and glad of heart, for all the goodness that the Lord had done for David his servant, and for Israel his people."

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

E. E.; B. N.; T. M.; CIVIS.; R. A.; and MICROS; are under consideration.

We think that P. C. and H. V. need be under no concern about the expression "Crown Him Lord of all." It is merely figurative language, intended to express the most reverential homage to our Divine Lord. Even in the august earthly solemnity which at this moment is occupying public attention, the coronation does not imply the conferring of title or honour, but the expression of dutiful allegiance.

We are happy to be favoured with the following explanation from Professor Malden, of London University College. He says: "In your last Number, in an article entitled 'Review of Works on National Education,' a passage is quoted from Mr. Burgess's pamphlet, in which Mr. Burgess cites the assertion of Mr. Simpson, in his examination before a Committee of the House of Commons, that I agree with him substantially in his opinions upon popular education. I am very glad to take this opportunity of making public the contradiction which I have already addressed to Mr. Burgess in private. I happened never to have read through Mr. Simpson's Evidence, and was not aware that he had made this assertion, till I saw it repeated by Mr. Burgess. Mr. Simpson was not justified in making this statement. Mr. Simpson is my brother-in-law, and a person senior to myself; and as he is warm in the defence of his opinions, I have avoided discussion with him upon subjects upon which I did not agree with him; and he has unfortunately mistaken this abstinence from controversy for acquiescence in his system. At the time when Mr. Simpson delivered his evidence, I had never expressed any general opinion upon the subject of popular education, because I had not fully considered the subject in all its bearings. Now, however, I have no hesitation in stating, that although I agree with Mr. Simpson in some details respecting physical and intellectual education, I dissent from him entirely on the main parts of his plan, and especially with respect to the general expediency of the separation of religious from secular education."

The communication of the Rev. C. Dodgson, the Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon, did not reach us till much too late for our present Number—indeed, till after the above Answers to Correspondents were written; but we shall readily insert it in our next.

ERRATA.

AT p. 367, line 1, for "kick" read "hurl." At p. 376, line 15, for "be translated," read "be *thus* translated."

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 8. AUGUST. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE TEMPTATION.

For the Christian Observer.

"TRINITY in Unity" seems not only to be an essential attribute of the Divine nature, but also (if I may so speak, not of course meaning any analogy,) to pervade creation throughout its various departments. In more than one passage St. Paul speaks of man as composed of three parts—body, soul, and spirit. He tells us that "the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart;" and again, in reference to this trinity in man's nature, prays that his "whole spirit, and soul, and body, may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." And as there is a Trinity, in the Divine nature, of essential good; as there is a trinity in the nature of man, vibrating as it does in the middle moral space, between the diabolical and Divine; so also is there a trinity, in the diabolical nature, of essential evil—"the world, the flesh, and the devil"—which, by a profoundly wise adaptation, meets man at every point, and appeals to each part of his compound nature by a congenial and sympathetic temptation.

Our Lord's temptation was, no doubt, designed to exhibit a colossal representation of that which is common to man, and it partakes of this triple character. It appeals to body, soul, and spirit, and tempts to sensuality, to worldly ambition, and to spiritual pride. The order of the temptations may be designed to represent, as in a climax, their several degrees of magnitude and danger: sensuality, the lowest and most palpable; spiritual pride, the most subtle and specious, and consequently the most dangerous. The first, calculated to level man with the beasts that perish; the last, with devils, who know and hate God. Or it may merely represent the natural order of temptation in its access to the soul: first, sensuality, which, in some shape and some degree, assails every child of Adam; then, ambition, a moral pestilence, which moves in a higher atmosphere, and assails those only who have lifted their hands above the mire of sensuality, yet have not been thoroughly extricated from earth, and soared to purer regions, and set their affections on things above: last of all, spiritual

pride, which evidently can tempt those alone who have made a profession of religion, and entered upon a religious course, and which arrests in that course many who, but for its blighting influence, would to all appearance have run well. Spiritual pride is a moral disease of the soul, most fatal because generally unperceived by its subject; and to counteract its subtle and deadly venom, many of those chastenings which afflict God's people are prescribed in mercy by the Divine Physician, as a bitter but necessary antidote. Its polluting touch converts even grace into poison, and often makes that which should have been for our wealth to be unto us an occasion of falling; thus rendering it necessary that even the abundance of the revelations should be accompanied with a thorn in the flesh, lest we should be exalted above measure; and that not only the bounties of Providence, but even the blessings of grace—not only the gifts, but even the graces of the Spirit, should be tempered with humiliations.

When we consider the agent and subject in the temptation—the great deceiver, and the Incarnate God—we can have no doubt that our Lord's temptation was to the very essences of sin, and therefore classifies, under the simplest and most comprehensive heads, every temptation which is common to man. If so, we should perhaps restrain to a sense too narrow and confined the first temptation, "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread," were we to suppose it merely a call to sensuality. Perhaps, it rather suggests that distrust of Divine Providence and Grace for all things necessary to life and happiness which characterizes the natural man, who, whatever his professions may be, lives without God in the world. It may describe that practical atheism, which, in every perplexity and distress, trusts but in man, makes flesh its arm, and in heart departs from God; and which, in that restless and incessant pursuit after happiness, inseparable from the nature of man, habitually forsakes God, the Fountain of living waters, and hews out for itself cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water.

As our Lord's fasting forty days and forty nights, when connected with his assertion of that high dignity, proves him to be very God; so, that he "afterwards hungered" equally proves him to be very man—subject to all our innocent wants and infirmities: and let us observe, that it was upon one of those infirmities, stimulated by present circumstances, that Satan grafted his first temptation. Our Lord "was an hungered," and the tempter invites Him to exert his Divine power, if he really possessed such, for his supply. Satan is an artful and practised assailant, and never fails to point his battery against that quarter which inherent weakness, or favouring circumstances, render most vulnerable: and, therefore, while true religion is without partiality, as without hypocrisy, and has respect unto *all* God's commandments, it guards against with double vigilance, and repels with double zeal, those sins to which we are most prone, and which, from our constitutional temperament, or our providential circumstances, do most easily beset us.

If we would know what is the root and principle of sin in the soul, let us inquire what that poison was which Satan injected into the souls of our first parents, and attempted to inject into that of our Blessed Lord; and do we not find it to be—unbelief? He well knew that if he could but introduce this spark of evil into the magazine of man's corrupt heart, it would soon explode with a fatal shock, and

burn to the lowest hell. He had but too fatally succeeded in insinuating a doubt of God's truth into the minds of our first parents, and would now wield the same weapon in his conflict with the second Adam. The voice of God had but just declared to Him, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" but Satan would tempt Him to bring God's word to the test of reason, not of faith, and to argue its falsehood from his present destitution. He thus prefaces his two first temptations, "If thou be the Son of God:" thus tempting him, not only to doubt the truth of God's word, but also to banish that spirit of adoption which cries "Abba, Father;" and which, wherever it abides, is the power of God unto salvation in the soul.

Two of the temptations which Satan suggested to our Lord were to the opposite extremes of sin—first, to distrust God's providential care, "Command that these stones be made bread:" and when he could not effect this, he would lead him on to the opposite extreme, and tempt him to presume upon it, "Cast thyself down." And believe me that it requires much consultation with God in secret prayer, and much of that Divine wisdom which God alone can give, to walk safely and steadily along the narrow and dangerous path which alone leadeth unto life; and when we shun the gulf of sin on one side, to avoid plunging into it on the other. It is difficult, for example, in the conduct of our temporal concerns, to avoid covetousness and undue anxiety, without negligence, prodigality, and wasteful extravagance. In our daily intercourse with others, it is difficult to avoid the melancholy gloom and ascetic austerity of superstition, without passing into the opposite extreme of levity and ungodly mirth. It is difficult to avoid the unbending sternness, the rude incivility, the harshness and severity of scruple, without compromise of strict principle, sacred truth, holiness of heart and life. In our own spiritual experience, it is difficult to avoid legality, without spiritual sloth; or, on the other hand, indolence, without spiritual pride. It is difficult to steer clear of the Scylla of self-righteousness on this side, without verging, unsafely, towards the all-absorbing Charybdis of antinomian licentiousness on the other. It is difficult to avoid, as in the case before us, distrust without presumption; and when the despairing sinner has consented to believe the free and full promises of the Gospel —that the Divine mercy is able, and willing, to pardon, and to save him *from* his sins—not to stretch that mercy beyond its due limits, and persuade himself that it will save him *in* his sins. But, blessed be God, greater is He that is for us than he that is against us. God's promise is pledged to us, as to our Lord, to keep us in all our ways —in every path of duty, however intricate and dangerous: and until we quit that narrow path for the broad way of sin, and wilfully rush within the limits of Satan's chain, the monster may growl to terrify us, but cannot devour, or even wound. He may solicit us to sin, as he did our Blessed Lord, "Cast *thyself* down;" but though we stood upon a pinnacle of the temple—on an eminence of danger, and where a touch could precipitate us into ruin—if we be but faithful to Divine Grace and to ourselves, he cannot put forth a finger to effect it. Unless our own will consents, all his attempts are impotent, and must prove abortive—or rather, they will but redound to God's glory, and to our own greater happiness. "Who can harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good? But and if ye suffer for righteous-

ness' sake, happy are ye." "The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you"—"on your part He is glorified."

In resisting and contending against Satan, our Lord has recourse to but one weapon—the only offensive weapon in the whole armoury of the Christian—"the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Happy is it for us, that instead of being obliged to combat the wiles of Satan, and the sophistry of deceit, with the resources of human intellect and human learning, the most ignorant and the weakest may be endued with Divine wisdom and Divine strength, while, with the simplicity of a little child, he receives every assault upon the shield of faith, and, with our Lord, knows but one argument where God has clearly spoken, "It is written:" and if Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, and misquotes, and perverts, and mutilates Scripture to deceive him, still holds fast his divinely tempered weapon; brings every argument and every quotation of his adversary "to the law and to the testimony;" "compares spiritual things with spiritual;" replies, "It is written again;" and by diligent comparison, and humble prayer for illuminating grace—for that "unction from the Holy One" by which we "know all things"—discerns the mind of the Spirit.

But it is not sufficient to this end that the Bible should be carried in our hands, and its pages turned over for reference, as each sudden temptation meets us unexpectedly in our path, or each evil suggestion of Satan rapidly crosses our mind. It is not when the enemy has entered the citadel that we should fly to the armoury for weapons of defence. The Bible should, by frequent and prayerful study, be imbibed and treasured up in the heart, so that its holy doctrines, and principles, and precepts should form the nature and stamp the character of the soul.

In two of his temptations Satan's object was to ensnare our Lord, and lead him imperceptibly into sin: in the other, he strips off the mask of hypocrisy, directly proposes a palpable sin, and substitutes for deception the wages of unrighteousness. And if, when already foiled, he resorted in desperation to this last resource, how certainly, and with how great probability of success, will he tempt with some attractive bait, to plunge into some awful gulf of sin, those whom he has already gently led on, from step to step, until they stand upon its brink! In this case, his appeal is made to that which his own sad experience taught him is one of the most powerful principles of evil in the soul—ambition. He shows to our Lord—perhaps by some optical illusion, which itself furnished a lively emblem of the unsubstantial and transitory character of the happiness which they minister—"all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them;" tells him, as St. Luke relates, that all these were placed at his disposal; and proposes, "If thou wilt fall down and worship me, all shall be thine." Satan was a liar from the beginning, and, doubtless, spake falsely when he said that all this power was *delivered* unto him; but this power has been usurped, and is daily exercised by him, within those limits which the decrees of God's eternal wisdom have defined. There is a sense in which Satan is—as Scripture expressly styles him—the prince of this world, yea, "the God of this world." He rules enthroned in the sinner's heart; his dominion is wide as that world which "lieth in the wicked one," his subjects many as the unregenerate. Much, too, of the patronage of the world is in his disposal,

and is given to his own people: for that man who attains any object in itself sinful, or any object, however lawful and innocent, by unjustifiable means—who, in order to obtain it, has been obliged to violate the precepts of God's law, or the dictates of his own conscience—has received it, not from the good providence of God, but from the hands of Satan. He has, by the sin which procured it, testified his allegiance, and done homage, and thus fallen down and worshipped him. And while our Lord, without compromise or parley, indignantly spurned *all;* and at once discerned the cloven foot of the tempter in the conditions which he proposed, "Get thee behind me, Satan," is it not awful to look around, and see the myriads of souls that the great enemy daily purchases with but a portion of these, small as the dust upon the balance? How many, not only in the haunts of amusement—of pleasure, falsely so called, of covetousness, of ambition, those markets, those slaughter-houses of souls—but even in the haunts of poverty and wretchedness, have bartered their immortal spirits to their great enemy. How many, for the short-lived gratification of some sensual appetite that degrades them to a level with the beasts that perish—some mean ambition—some poor vanity, from which they do not even derive, as the sensualist does, a present though base pleasure—for some little portion more of worldly riches, which perhaps, in the intensity of that covetousness which has stimulated them to the pursuit, they fear to enjoy, and yet from which they must shortly part for ever—how many, I say, for some of these, and perhaps without even attaining their object, sin, and thus sell their souls to Satan! Oh that men would consider this: that they would remember their latter end: that they would seriously propose to themselves our Lord's important question, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

But what does the tempter offer? and what does the sinner gain? Satan, we may observe, offered to our blessed Lord nothing which was not already His by promise and covenant of his Heavenly Father. "Ask of me, and I will give Thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," was a promise to the Messiah, to be accomplished when the fulness of time has come, when the mystery of God has been finished, and the host of heaven, repeating with many voices the echoes of the seventh angel's trumpet, shall proclaim, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." Satan then could tempt our Lord but to anticipate the fulfilment of this promise, and by thus forestalling to defeat it. This malignant artifice must needs indeed have failed when it appealed to the holy Jesus: how fatally it has succeeded with *us*, the teeming wretchedness and sin which deluge a world, the workmanship of a bounteous, a holy, and an omnipotent Creator, give but too fearful testimony. Satan can offer to us, also, no substantial good, which our Heavenly Father is not willing—has not promised—to bestow; nor guard or extricate us from any real calamity from which God has not pledged himself to be our shield and refuge. Are we tempted to transgress the bounds of our appointed habitation in his kingdom of providence, or to reject the dictates of conscience, and violate the laws of his kingdom of grace, lest poverty should come in upon us as an armed man? Let us fall back upon the promises of

Infallible Truth, "Dwell in the land, and, verily, thou shalt be fed;" "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you;" "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Is the stronger fear which Satan would conjure up to tempt us, the vision of a bereaved widow, and of desolate orphans? Such fear is vain: "I have been young and now am old, and yet saw I never the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging their bread." Rally to that promise which has comforted many a dying saint, and shed a cheering light upon the vista through which he cast his last retrospective glance, when about to enter upon the valley of the shadow of death, "Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive, and let thy widows trust in me." Does Satan tempt you into sin with the lure of some deceptious, short-lived pleasure? God outbids His rival for your heart; offers you, with "righteousness, peace and joy;" invites you, even here, to "rejoice evermore;" and promises to him that overcometh, that he shall eat of the hidden manna, and drink of that river of pleasures which is at his right hand for evermore. No: God withholds from us, and Satan bestows upon us, nothing which can conduce to our real happiness, here or ever. The kind and skilful Physician would, in love, refuse to us that cordial regimen for which our diseased constitution was yet unprepared, and which therefore would prove fatal: the anxious expectant of our inheritance would, in treachery, press it upon us, for our ruin. How men may lose, if not the *possession* of those good creatures which God would give us richly to enjoy, yet the enjoyment which they were designed to minister, by unprovidentially and unlawfully precipitating the attainment of them, those best can tell who know, by a melancholy experience, that there is mirth and laughter in which the spirit is sad, envied society in which the heart is desolate, wealth which burdens, pleasures which pall, honours which inwardly shame, and dignities which degrade their possessor:—while others can testify, in happy contrast with this, that we may be "troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; having nothing, yet possessing all things:"—that there are

"Tears that delight, and sighs that waft to heaven."

He "who will be rich," may, to the eye of sense, attain his object; yet, in stabbing his own conscience, pierce himself through with many sorrows. The cup of revelry may stimulate the spirits to unwonted glee; but "the end of that mirth is heaviness," for "at the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." That men may lose, if not the fruit, its relish, by gathering it prematurely from the yet green tree, *he* can tell who has plucked, with Eve, forbidden fruit and tasted but shame and misery;—who, with Solomon, has tested that proverb's truth, "Bread of deceit is sweet to a man, but afterwards his mouth shall be filled with gravel;"—or who, invited, not by an angel of the Lord, but by the great deceiver, has sympathized in the Evangelist's experience, but without the Evangelist's motives, principles, and hopes, "I took—and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey; and as soon as I had eaten it, my belly was bitter." The syren, Pleasure, may deck herself with meretricious ornaments and deceitful smiles, and, in her sorceries and enchantments, with fasci-

nating voice melodiously thus sing, "Stolen waters are sweet; and bread eaten in secret is pleasant; but he" who listens "knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her guests are in the depths of hell."

The close of this conflict between the tempter and our Lord furnishes a cheering comment on the Apostle's words, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." Our Lord steadily and successfully resisted,—"then the devil leaveth him, and angels came and ministered unto him." We too are surrounded by a cloud of witnesses, interested spectators of our Christian warfare. Let us then walk circumspectly, as in the day, and in the view of this holy, this august assembly. Let us quit us like men, knowing that spirits surround us who sympathize in all our weal or woe; that "there is joy in heaven, joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Let us then "lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus," once crucified, but now enthroned; once robed in mockery, now clothed with light as with a garment; once crowned with thorns, now crowned with the diadem of heaven; once tempted, now occupied in interceding for and succouring them that are tempted. Let us but be faithful to Divine grace and to ourselves, and often will those ministering spirits, whose glad office it is to minister to the heirs of salvation, be sent to us on some errand of mercy. Some angel from heaven, Divinely commissioned, will strengthen us in the hour of trial, and minister consolation at its close. Some angelic choir will waft, with hymns of joy, our parting spirit into Abraham's bosom. When we walk through the dark valley of the shadow of death, Jesus himself, the God of angels, will be with us, and comfort us; he will come and receive us unto himself, that where he is there we may be also.

J. M. H.

REMINISCENCES OF BISHOP HALL. No. III.

(*Continued from p.* 422.)

My last letter left me about to visit the dear Bishop's burying-place at Heigham, in approaching which I could not but be reminded of the troubles of Archbishop Parker, whose bones—after having been disinterred by his implacable enemies—finally found their present resting-place in Lambeth chapel, with the humble but significant memorial of "Hic tandem requiescit Matthæus Parker, olim Archiepiscopus!" The only difference between the two cases appears to have been, that in that of Hall the enemies of all good did not (as Burke says) "wage war with the dead."

As I entered the village of Heigham, a large house of solemn appearance and ancient date, which stands above a quarter of a mile short of the church, left me in little doubt that it must have been there that the deprived bishop had waited his final change. It is now split into tenements—the principal of which is a public-house ("to what base uses we may return!") The love of hunting out localities—which will only be understood by antiquaries—carried me over this interesting, though now dilapidated mansion; and while there could be no doubt as to the apartments which Hall would have daily occupied, I pleased myself with imagining that partly from my own

observation, and partly from the tradition of the place, I was in the same room where his pious spirit would have found its long-expected release, and joined "the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven."

The house has on its front a somewhat conspicuous date of 1615; but the first object which presents itself on entering what is now the hall, is an ancient and well-wrought piscina, or the receptacle used in the times of Popery for conveying away (by means of a central duct) the sacramental wine after its consecration—the mistaken presumption being, that having then become, as was contended, the actual blood of our Lord, it could not be applied to any common or profane use. This piscina is frequently mistaken by moderns for the vessel for holding the holy water; but it is never found, in fact, in any of our ancient churches, except in parts where a sacramental table has formerly stood, whereas the holy water was always placed at or near the door of entrance. I was at first induced to suppose from its situation that this had been a receptacle for holy water, but was soon convinced of my mistake, on finding that it was plainly a piscina with its usual orifice; besides which, it is surmounted by a well-wrought niche and canopy, though now divested of the Virgin or other saint which once filled it. Either, therefore, this beau-morceau of stonework has always occupied its present place, in which case the hall which contains it was once a chapel, or else it had been transferred to the present spot (perhaps from the parish church) at the time of the Reformation, and fixed as a mere ornament of the house in which it now appears. That the house itself was standing long before the date of 1615 (appearing on its front) is attested by the several dates of 1587 over a side door, and 1595 on a gable end—but as even those dates do not carry us back to the reign of Popery, it is most probable that the ornament in question had been transferred from some other place. Here, however, as I said, the good bishop waited his dismission; and here, ripe in years and full of faith, he found the end of his labours and his trials—though not till after great bodily sufferings had been added to the mental sorrows which the loss of his much-loved wife and his bitter persecutions had occasioned. I now walked to the church of Heigham, which is a very plain structure, and found a mural monument to the Bishop on the south wall, so unworthy of him that I suspect it must have sustained some considerable alteration after its first erection—the whole centre at present consisting of a gilded skeleton, holding in one hand a scroll, with the heathen motto "Debemus" [for debemur] "morti nos, nostraque;" and in the other a scroll, with the words "Persolvit et quietus est." To my own mind this tasteless figure conveyed the impression that it had been substituted for other matter once occupying the same space (perhaps a character of the deceased) which it had supplanted; but however this be, we now find at the top the words "Obiit 8 September, anno æræ Christianæ 1656; æt. suæ 82;" and at the foot of the monument, "Josephus Hallus, olim humilis Ecclesiæ servus." The disjointed collocation of these words—the date of the death, &c. appearing in a different part of the monument from the name of the deceased—favours the notion of a subsequent metamorphosis of this monumental record: but I come now to the flat stones which may be supposed to cover the bodies of the Bishop and his wife. Upon the bishop's are the words, "Induviæ Josephi Hall, olim Norvicensis Ecclesiæ servi, repositæ 8°. die mensis Septembris, anno Domini 1656,—ætatis suæ 82°. Vale, lector! et

æternitati prospice!" The other inscription is, "Mrs Elizabeth, the deare and vertuous consort of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich, with whom she comfortably lived forty-eight years, changed this mortall life for an eternall, August 1652, in the yeare of her age 69. Farewell, reader! and minde eternitie!" It will scarcely be believed that a modern pew has been permitted to cover the word recording the actual number of years which the Bishop and his wife lived together, which I am only able to supply from Blomefield's history: but the obliteration of a mere monumental date sinks into insignificance when compared with the complete demolition, by modern churchwardens (not to say their rectors), of the finest specimens of ancient ecclesiastical architecture, which I have witnessed elsewhere, in the case of Gothic doors and windows closed up, ancient monuments defaced, and noble roofs of oaken beams and rafters, which had for many centuries attracted the admiration of every eye of taste, and defied all injury from the lapse of years, now cautiously closed up with a snug white-washed ceiling, in order to preserve a modern congregation from the cold, although at the almost certain hazard of inviting the dry rot, from the exclusion, for the first time, for so many ages, of that circulation of the air which had so long excluded the inroads of damp and decay. But to return: I could not contemplate the designation of the pious Bishop in the epithets of "the former humble servant of the church at Norwich," without referring such phraseology to *himself*. For this supposition there seemed the same internal evidence as I found at Salisbury, where, in the late Bishop's usual sitting-room (adjoining the picture gallery), I found a small but very curious old portrait of the excellent Bishop Jewell, with this inscription, "Væ mihi si non evangelizavero," ["Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel!"] a text which I could hardly suppose any painter would have ventured to place under a patron's portrait, if the Bishop himself had not desired him to do so—a remark (I recollect) in which the late valued Bishop [Burgess] entirely agreed with me, when I mentioned it to him. All this humility on the part of Hall was in perfect consistency with the remarkable opening of his Will, "I, Joseph Hall, D.D., *not worthy to be called Bishop of Norwich, &c.*—First, I bequeath my soul, &c. My body I leave to be interred, without any funeral pomp, at the discretion of my executors, with only this monition, that I do not hold God's house (meaning a church, consecrated to God's service) a meet repository for the bodies of the greatest of saints," &c. It seems, from Blomefield, that this direction for his interment in the church-yard had not (as it was in the case of Bishop Ken, at Frome) been complied with, although it served to mislead Lloyd and others, who naturally imagined that because the Bishop's will had so directed, the executors had therefore obeyed his wishes.

On returning to London, I found some difficulty in procuring a copy of the funeral sermon for the Bishop, which, Blomefield observes, was preached by John Whitefoot, M.A., Rector of Heigham, at St. Peter's Mancroft, in Norwich, on 30th September, 1656. This sermon (the historian adds) was dedicated to Robert Hall, the Bishop's eldest son, and was preached by the Bishop's consent, after much entreaty on the part of Whitefoot for his permission. No copy of this discourse was among the immense collection of Funeral Sermons made by my valued friend the late Alexander Chalmers, in order to

his Biographical Dictionary, and sold at his decease; but I found one in that precious depository the Library of the British Museum, which so rarely disappoints the literary student in the pursuit of whatever is most rare and valuable; nor did I know, till after I had prepared this little memorial, that this sermon had been reprinted in an excellent volume by Mr. Jones, called "Bishop Hall's Life and Times," published in 1826, and reviewed in the Christian Observer for 1827. This sermon is entitled "Death's Alarum," from the text "And the time drew nigh that Israel must die." (Gen. xlvii. 29.) It contains, as is usual in the funereal memorials of that age, much that is quaint, and more that is beside the subject; but, in addition to the testimony borne to the character of the Bishop, it includes many valuable notices of his life which are no longer to be obtained elsewhere—a circumstance, indeed, which renders these mortuary contributions perfectly invaluable to the biographer. Of this, many examples might be given; and perhaps it may not be generally known, that we had retained just nothing of the biography of Gurnall (the pious author of the Christian Armour) beyond what was supplied by his funeral sermon preached by Burkitt the Commentator.

To the Bishop's funeral sermon an engraved portrait of him had once been prefixed, with the silver medal which he received at the Council of Dort depending from his neck; in his hand was a book, and the arms of the See were found impaled with his own. This portrait, alas! has not escaped the spoliation of the collectors of engravings, which cannot always be called "pious frauds," as these likenesses of the times are too often purloined by the dealers in books for love of "filthy lucre." But to the more enduring portrait of the sermon. After two Greek quotations from Themistocles and Synesius, with which I shall trouble none of your readers, and two from Seneca, which I shall translate for such ladies as do not learn Latin,* the preacher, in his dedication, observes as follows:

"It contains a short representation, taken in haste (as all pictures which are done after the parties' death), hoping they may afford some present satisfaction to the many that justly expect a better account of his life, which in your name (Robert Hall's), by whom it is best able to be done, I here presume to promise, because I am not ignorant of your being furnished with some modest and yet remarkable collections thereof left by his own hand."—[This seems an allusion to the auto-biography already noticed, which the Bishop's son appears to have permitted to speak for itself, but without adding from his own stores what would now have been so valuable. Permit me here to quote, though without order, one or two passages which I thought worth extracting. After observing that—"there were none of the ancient Bishops' lives more saintlike since those of their predecessors, the Apostles," the preacher adds,]—"that such a fact may be useful in these evil days towards a demonstration that Prelacy and piety are not such inconsistent things as some would make them, and that the men which are of, or for, that order should not be excluded (as they now are by the monopolizers of that name) from the number of *Saints*, and consequently not debarred from that which is now asserted to be the common interest and indefeasible right of all Saints of whatever persuasion—that is, the liberty of worshipping God according to their consciences and the best light of their understanding,—a good part of Scripture is altogether taken up with a narrative of the lives of Saints, and those, too, not altogether canonical in every line." . . . . "The petition in the Litany, against sudden death, is unexceptionable in the Latin; 'a morte *improvisa*, libera nos, Domine.' 'He that does not foresee death, cannot be provided for it;

* "Id agendum est, ut satis vixerimus." (Sen. Ep. 23.)—"Ut satis vixerimus, nec anni, nec dies facient, sed animus."(Ib. Ep. 62.) "This must be provided for, that we live enough.—That we live enough, neither years, nor days will suffice, but the mind," [to use them.]

and he that is not, must be eternally undone by it.'"—[I proceed, however, to his remarks on the Bishop.]—"Two years ago he was chosen Rhetoric Professor in the University of Cambridge, and performed the office with extraordinary applause. He was noted for a singular wit from his youth: A most acute rhetorician and an elegant poet, he understood many tongues; and in the rhetoric of his own he was second to none that lived in his time. He always made it his business to see and search into the things of God, with a zealous diligence rather than a bold curiosity. He was one that conversed as much with God, and drew as nigh to him in Divine meditation (which is the only ordinary way of seeing God in the flesh), as any man of his time. He was a great master of the orthodox faith, and one of the first that taught this church the art of Divine meditation. Few men of his age have ascended so high upon Jacob's ladder as he did; he was one that (with Israel) lived and died in a Goshen of light in the midst of Egyptian darkness. He was an upright man, too, before God; 'an Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile.' As Nazianzen says of Basil, 'eruditis pietate, et piis eruditionis laude antecellens,' 'those that were most eminent for learning, he excelled in piety; and those that were most famous for piety, he excelled in learning.' He was one that wrestled with God much and often in prayer; and prevailed much. And if we be yet capable of the blessing, I hope we shall one day enjoy the fruit of those prayers wherein he wrestled with God for this poor church. He was a man of a smooth terse wit and tongue, and of a calm, gentle, meek, and moderate spirit; as they all know that knew any thing of him: a man of a mild, serene, and calm aspect [who ever saw it ruffled into any appearance of disorderly passion?], and of a quick and lively spirit. He was not twice a child (though he lived long enough to have been so); but always one in our Saviour's sense; namely, in humility and innocence. One that much excelled in those dove-like fruits of the spirit, which St. Paul mentions in Gal. v. 22, as loving, and as much beloved, as any man of his order in the three nations. One that got the birth-right from heaven, and the blessing from men too, without dissembling for it: while other rough Esaus were hunting abroad for wild venison, thinking to please their father, he stayed quietly at home, and observing the directions of his mother, the Church, went away smooth with the benison. Some strugglings he had with his rougher brethren, whom he did not strive so much to supplant, as to supple with his smooth moderation and humility; and so far he prevailed in this design, as that instead of ill words or knocks, he met with a kiss and respectful embracements from many of them that had been his adversaries, because they envied him the birth-right of his order and dignity; and all men honoured the Doctor, though some loved not the Bishop. He travelled with persons of honour into France, Germany, Holland, and Scotland; and God was ever with him wherever he went. Some troubles and perils he met with in his journeys, as Jacob did when Laban pursued him with one troop and Esau with another. But a kind Providence was ever ready to redeem him. He was a faithful shepherd, that diligently watched over the flocks that his Master committed to his charge, and took extraordinary pains in feeding them, for above twenty years together. Whilst he was the private pastor, first of Halsted in Suffolk, and after of Waltham in Essex, he preached thrice a-week in a constant course. Yet as himself witnessed, *never durst climb up into the pulpit to preach any sermon whereof he had not before penned every word, in the same order wherein he hoped to deliver it; although in his expressions, he was no slave to syllables, neither made use of his notes.* Nor did his industry cease, or so much abate, at his preferments. He hath given the world as good an account of his time, as any man in it; and one that knew the value of time, and esteemed the loss of it more than a temporal loss, because it hath a necessary influence upon eternity. It is well known in this city [Norwich] how forward he was to preach in any of our churches, till he was first forbidden by men, and at last disabled by God; and when he could not preach himself, as oft and as long as he was able, this learned Gamaliel was (not content only, but) very diligent to sit at the feet of the youngest of his disciples; as diligent an hearer as he had been a preacher. How oft have we seen him walking alone like old Jacob, with his staff to Bethel the house of God." [This most probably refers to the passage between the house and the church at Heigham, from a quarter to half of a mile]. "He was fruitful in children: the husband of one wife, a grave, virtuous, matron, with whom he lived forty-nine years: Israel at last wanted bread for his family. I cannot say this man did so; but how near he came to it, and by what means, we all know; but must not complain, because *he* never did. He had not the kindness that Israel had in Egypt, to have any allowance for his maintenance from the Lord of the country: yet he never wanted. He was indeed a rare mirror of patience under all his crosses; which, toward his

latter end, were multiplied upon him. The loss of his estate he seemed insensible of, as if he had parted with all; as Jacob did with a good part of his to pacify his angry brother; having well learned as well to want as to abound. I have heard him oft bewail the spoils of the Church, but very rarely did he so much as mention his own losses, but took joyfully the spoiling of his goods. When he was laid among the pots (that is, says the Septuagint and the Vulgate, '*inter cleros*'), yet was he as 'the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold.'* Of late years, and especially the last, he was sorely afflicted with bodily diseases, and bore them all with as much patience as hath been seen in any flesh, except that of our Saviour's. We have heard of the patience of Job, but never saw a fairer copy of it than was in this man. Israel lived to be very old, and at last grew so weak that he was scarce able to rise up upon his bed to bless his children; and so it was with our father. Methinks I see him yet as he was upon his bed, how he *strengthened himself* to confirm others (that sought it) with his fatherly blessing, and that, too, with the same good old ceremony that Jacob first used, namely, the laying on of his hands. His days were few and evil, in Jacob's comparative sense, and yet many and good; for he died in a good old age, full of days, and full of good works, '*canus virtutibus*,' white with virtues. He came to his grave in a full age, 'like as a shock of corn cometh in, in his season.' He was crowned with the silver crown of age in his grey hairs, (Prov. xvi. 31,) and now is crowned with the golden crown of immortality. When his time drew nigh that he was to die he much longed for death, and was ready to bid it welcome, and spake always very kindly of it. It was an odd word of St. Francis, when the physicians told him the time of death drew nigh, 'Bene veniat' (inquit) 'soror mors,' 'Welcome, my sister death.' The expression in Job is not much unlike (xvii. 14), 'I have said to corruption, thou art my father, to the worm, thou art my mother and *my sister*.' So did this good man welcome death as if he had been to embrace a mother or a sister. He took good notice of the approach of death, and set his house in order, as Israel did, by distributing the blessings that God had left him to his children. He endeavoured also to prepare others for that change, by his last books and last sermons, which were all upon the last things—Death and Judgment, Heaven and Hell.

"Israel left his children in Egypt when he died, but with a prophetical promise of their return into Canaan; our Israel hath left us (I may not say in bondage, but) in a sad condition, and left us without a prophecy, though not without his prayers for our happy return into Canaan. Well, he is gone, non nobis ereptus, sed periculis, as Ambrose said of his brother, in that most elegant oration 'De Obitu Fratris:' taken away, not so much from us, as from the perils of the times. It was some comfort to him that he lived not to see the funeral of the Church, though he saw it drawing home almost at the last gasp; and if there could be as much sorrow in heaven for the perverseness of sinners, as there is joy at their conversion, doubtless this holy man could not yet be at rest. 'But Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel knows us not.' (Isa. lxiii. 16). And the more happy is he if he doth not; and I hope we are never the more unhappy; for whether he knows of our state or not, it is piously to be believed he prays for us, ὡς οἶμαι, as Nazianzen said of Basil. When Israel died, *the Egyptians* mourned for him; and I am persuaded so do some of the worst of men for him.

"The streights of time both for preparing and delivering this testimony of his life, hath inforced me to pass over the particulars of his preferments, dignities, and honourable employments by his Prince; among which, that to the Synod of Dort should not be forgotten—especially for the great respect he had there from the Foreign Divines and States, and his excellent moderation shewn in those unhappy disputes, concerning which he afterwards drew up such a collection of accorded truths as was offered to be subscribed by some of the most eminent parties on both sides—which reconciliatory papers, then unhappily buried, are very much to be desired, and may be hoped for in time, together with a compleater account of his life written by himself: but whatever becomes of them, he was one whose moderation was known to all men; and his zeal for an holy peace in the Church is abundantly manifested by those writings of his which are already extant. I cannot so much as mention all his virtues, but must not forget so great an one as his charity; which above, and before all things, as the two great Apostles exhort (Col. iii. 14; and 1 Pet. iv. 8,) he was careful to put

* "Si dormiatus inter medios cleros pennæ columbæ deargentatæ, et posteriora dorsi ejus in pallore auri." (Biblia Sacra vulgatæ editionis, tribus tomis distincta. Romæ, ex typographia Apostolica Vaticana, 1590.)—*Zenas.*

on. Besides his spiritual alms of prayers, godly admonitions, comforts, and holy counsels, whereof he was very liberal, his bodily alms were constant and bountiful. In the parish where he last lived, he gave a weekly voluntary contribution of money to certain poor widows, to his dying day, over and above his imposed rates, wherein he has never spared. And as the widow's handful of meal and her cruse of oil did not waste by feeding the old Prophet, so did this Prophet's barrel that was low, and his cruse that was little, not hold out only, but seemed to increase by feeding the widows, as appeared by that liberal addition of alms which he gave by his will to the town where he was born, and to this city where he died, [£30 a-piece).

"He was one that (as St. John exhorts) loved not in word or in tongue only, but in deed and in truth, (1 John iii. 18); and shewed it plentifully upon all occasions. Four things as yet remain with us below, of this heavenly saint. His children, his works, his body, and his name. Of his children, I may say he is not all gone; he has left us as good a portion of himself behind in his sons, in whom we may yet see him and hold him. I shall not wish any one of them the double portion of their father's spirit, but rather that they may be (as indeed they are) all coheirs thereof. For his works, I hope with reverence I may lawfully say of them, as the Psalmist doth of God's, that they all praise him: at least I may say, as the Spirit doth in the Apocalypse, 'Blessed are the dead that died in the Lord, for he resteth from his labours, and his works follow him.' Blessed is he because his works (that is, the reward of them) follow him.

"His occasional mediations are more precious than the elaborate works of other men; for his body, that is already laid up in his dormitory without the honourable ceremony of embalming" [a reference apparently to his being buried out of the Cathedral.] "But though he wanted that and other ceremonies of deserved honour (which his own humility and the envy of the times denied him), yet doth he not want that which the wise man saith is better than a precious oil or ointment, a good name. For his mitre, which fell with the royal crown, when the time was come that his old master's prophecy was to be fulfilled," ['No Bishop, no King,'] "he hath a crown of glory set upon his head.

"Methinks now I hear some of you say with Balaam, 'Let me die the death of the righteous,' &c. I will tell you how that may be; follow the steps of his holy life, and the instructions of his godly books; learn to prize the spiritual birth-right above any present fleshly enjoyments, and to wrestle with God for it in prayer; meditate much and often of heaven and heavenly things as he did; imitate him in his holy 'vows,' and be careful to pay them. Follow, I say, the steps of his faith and charity, and you cannot miss of such an end. 'For as many as walk according to this rule, peace shall be upon them, and upon the Israel of God,' (Gal. vi. 16)."

It must be admitted, that the parallel which is thus pursued by the preacher, between the patriarch of his text and the prelate of his discourse, is not without great interest, as highly illustrative of the piety and sufferings of the subject of his sermon; and we soon forget, in the heart-felt honesty of his attachment to the cause of truth and the virtues of Hall, the quaint peculiarities of a less refined age of literary composition. I had here hoped to offer a few remarks in conclusion, but find I must yet claim the indulgence of another paper.

ZENAS.

THE REV. C. DODGSON ON THE RIPON ORDINATION QUESTIONS; WITH REMARKS IN REPLY.

[We have great pleasure in inserting the following letter, which is written in a temperate and Christian spirit; and it will be very gratifying instead of displeasing to us, if the statement and vindication contained in it shall be considered adequate and satisfactory. We must however, in justice both to ourselves and to the subject, add some notes; but they are intended to be chiefly explanatory. Mr. Dodgson, with great candour, does justice to the spirit in which our remarks were written, and candidly acquits us of the charge of

wilful misapprehension; but we cannot see that there was any misapprehension, wilful or otherwise, and Mr. Dodgson's letter does not convict us of any.]

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,—I have read, with the respectful attention due to the temperate and Christian spirit in which they are written, some remarks in your last Number upon the questions proposed to the candidates at the late ordination at Ripon. As the examining chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon, and the real author of the questions referred to, I naturally felt an interest on the subject; and it is in the same character that I venture to address this letter to you, feeling assured that you will appreciate my motives for doing so, and respect them.

Let me first premise that I have no intention of entering into any argument on points of doctrine. Independently of the aversion which I have always felt to religious controversy in general, I feel that in a case like the present such a step would be improper. Nor do I wish to offer any *defence* of the particular course adopted in the examination; for I cannot recognize the principle that a Bishop is to be put upon his trial before the public in a matter of which he must himself be considered the fittest judge. My sole object is to remove the erroneous impressions as to *facts*, under which this review has been written, and which it is calculated to produce upon others: and, from the tone of it, I cannot doubt that you will be no less anxious than myself to free your readers from the misapprehension, which you have been, I am sure unintentionally, the means of causing (1.)

(1.) In this paragraph Mr. Dodgson says that he will neither discuss the doctrines in the Questions, nor defend the course adopted in the examination; but will apply himself solely to remove some erroneous impressions as to facts, under which he alleges that we laboured. This being his plan, we beg leave to say, that so far as we are concerned his letter is wholly irrelevant. We have nothing whatever to do with the facts which he refers to; we never went about inquiring what passed between the bishop or his chaplain, and the candidates, in private; we did not seek to know whether any candidate had been approved, admonished, or rejected; we always wish to abstain from such personal allusions; our business is with principles; and it was in regard to principles that we considered the questions in the pamphlet which we were reviewing. The points to which we directed our attention were, first, the doctrinal character of the questions; and, secondly, their propriety, even supposing them to be doctrinally correct; but both these points—the ipsissimæ points of the discussion—Mr. Dodgson passes over; and proceeds to inform us respecting certain details of fact of a private and personal nature, upon which we have no wish or authority to offer any remark. Certain questions are before the world in a published pamphlet; and it would have been quite enough for our argument, and much more agreeable to our feelings, to have regarded them generally and hypothetically; that is to say, supposing such questions to be set forth, to inquire into their doctrinal character and their propriety, without allusion to any individual or diocese; but after the wide publicity given to the matter, this would have been mere affectation; and we therefore took them as we found them.

Mr. Dodgson says that "he will not enter into any argument on points of doctrine," partly because he is averse to controversy, and partly because, "in a case like the present, such a step would be improper." But if Mr. Dodgson is so averse to controversy, why did he give rise to the pending discussions by drawing up for the use of the diocese of Ripon a series of questions so minutely

I would first suggest for your consideration the question whether such documents as those which have called forth your remarks can, under any circumstances, become a legitimate subject for public criticsim. The whole case is not—and from its nature cannot be—before

---

controversial? Surely there was a sufficiency of infinitely important questions connected with faith and practice, the *credenda, agenda,* and *abjuranda* of a Christian, with the duties of the sacred ministry, with biblical knowledge and even with ecclesiastical history, without making such account of knowing a young man's opinions about Calvinism and Arminianism, predestination and final perseverance, the Lambeth articles and "the conduct of the Calvinistic party." Could anything be more provocative of controversy than questions like these? Such questions are inevitably polemical; and the controversies alluded to, be it recollected, embrace, not the general matters upon which the members of the Anglican church differ from other bodies of Christians, but those which have excited, and continue to excite, the most warm and bitter controversies within her own pale. If Mr. Dodgson had been the most fierce of polemics, he could not have chosen (as the event has proved) topics more inflammable than some of those which he has heaped together in these questions. We do not, however, mean or believe that he is a "fierce polemic"—his letter to us is written in a mild and excellent spirit—we merely think that he honestly embraces a partial system, which he believes to be that of the Church of England; and that in these questions he availed himself of his influence and authority, as examining chaplain to the Bishop, to uphold it. He could not but know that there are thousands of clergymen, as devout, learned, and conscientious as himself, who entertain views altogether opposed to those upon which these questions are grounded; and that a considerable number of candidates thus circumstanced would probably come before him; why, then, did he so contrive his interrogations as to give much pain to one portion of his brethren, and a sort of diocesan triumph to the other?

But he adds, that to enter in any argument upon points of doctrine would be "improper." But why improper? He propounded certain doctrines in his examination of candidates for holy orders; these became a subject of public discussion; he in consequence writes, and with much kindness and courtesy, to explain what passed privately in the examination-room, and the animus of the whole proceeding; and this he considers not to be improper; it is no surrender of the prerogatives of official discretion to public inquiry; and yet to enter upon a question of doctrine is improper. Now the matter strikes us quite differently; if he saw fit to reply at all to what had been written upon the Ripon questions, he might, we think, have very fairly said, "I do not feel myself called upon to enter upon the question of *facts;* I will not open a bishop's examination-room to the public; but as to the doctrines which I hold, and make the basis of my examination, there can be nothing *improper* in giving my reasons for them." We do not say that it was necessary for him to do so; but there was nothing "improper" in his doing so—that is, if it was proper to reply at all. As the case stands, he enters into an explanation; but respecting that which made the explanation necessary he says nothing. We quoted Bishop Burnet as affirming that "the doctrine of sacramental justification is justly to be reckoned among the most mischievous errors that are in the Church of Rome;" we asserted that there is not a syllable in Scripture which countenances this mischievous error; we asserted, moreover, that it is "a grievously demoralizing doctrine, as we see proved by the conduct of the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland." Here was something that really required a reply; for if these charges are true, Mr. Dodgson,

the public. The printed questions do not constitute, do not fairly represent, the examination—an important, and in many cases the most important, part of which, is conducted in private. The conversations between the candidate and the examiner, of which his written answers

---

with the best intentions, and meaning only what is calculated to produce the fruits of holiness, is in reality indoctrinating candidates for the ministry in a system opposed to the Church of England, to Scripture, and to the interests of morality and virtue; for to send men to the parish register in order to know whether they are justified, instead of sending them to examine themselves in their consciences and lives, ("examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith"), tends to practical antinomianism. If, therefore, there had been a single text of holy writ which upholds such a doctrine, we cannot see that it would have been "improper" to have quoted it in reply to our remarks. Historical facts bear out our conclusions. Compare, in point of morality, Scotland with Ireland; or the Protestant cantons of Switzerland with the Romanist cantons. In a debate in the House of Commons last month, on the Prisons Bill, Mr. Langdale (we copy from the Times newspaper) "begged to call the attention of the noble Lord (J. Russell) to the situation in which Roman Catholics were placed in prison in respect of religious instruction. He believed that a very large proportion—as much as one third or one fourth—of the prisoners in this metropolis are members of this profession. He thought, therefore, that every means ought to be afforded them of obtaining religious consolation from spiritual advisers of the same persuasion." "Mr. Baines thought the suggestion entitled to a good deal of attention. He had no claim to put in on behalf of the Dissenters, who were not often to be found within the precincts of a prison." And how is this to be accounted for? The Roman Catholics in London are but a small fraction of the whole population; and yet their advocate says that one third or one fourth of the criminals in jails belong to them, while of the Protestant Dissenters the proportion is stated to be very small. How is this to be accounted for? We firmly believe by what Bishop Burnet so justly specifies of the mischievous tendency of the doctrine of sacramental justification. The Protestant Dissenters, on the contrary—little as we approve of the spirit of some of them—strongly inculcate upon their hearers the necessity of being born again, and of justification by faith—not the vicarious faith of we know not whom, and Mr. Dodgson declines to tell us whom, in unconscious baptism; but a practical, active, living, fruit-producing faith. We can assert, from practical experience in the two extremes of an episcopal city and a rustic population, that in visiting the sick, instructing the ignorant, and endeavouring to reclaim the profligate, one of the greatest impediments in the way of every exhortation to consider their doings, to turn to their Creator, and to work out their salvation, has been the belief that having been baptized in infancy, they are in a justified state before God, though they have never produced one single fruit of faith to support that conclusion. The Roman Catholic priesthood prepare themselves for this difficulty, by studying the volumes of Dens and other casuists, to instruct them to ascertain whether baptismal justification has been preserved or lost; what sins are venial, and what mortal; how justification *of congruity* is to be enhanced to justification *of condignity;* or, if lost, how a second justification is to be gained to supply its place; with many similar particulars, which are necessary to be considered, if once we admit the primal error on which the whole system is built. How would Mr. Dodgson teach his candidates practically to treat the case of an ignorant man, or a careless liver, or a decided profligate, who imagines himself in a state of justi-

are intended to form the ground-work; the fatherly instruction and advice constantly interposed by the Bishop; the questions proposed viva voce on points omitted in the papers; the mutual explanations tending to remove all misapprehension on either part; and finally,

---

fication; or the case of a penitent who thinks himself fallen from it. The true Protestant says, with Scripture, "By their fruits ye shall know them;" but Mr. Dodgson contends for a justification without any fruits at the time, and which may never bring forth any fruits hereafter.

But besides the character of the doctrine embodied in some of these interrogatories, we complained of them generally, upon the grounds so strongly and generally urged in the case of Bishop Marsh's eighty-seven questions; and this not only by those who objected to the opinions conveyed in those questions, but by those who, agreeing in the opinions, objected to the controversial character of the investigation. "We judge these questions," said the Christian Remembrancer, "to be inexpedient.....We fear that they have a tendency to counteract the range of a young man's professional studies; to give him a wrong bias at the very outset, and to make him a polemic in his pupilage.....They invite him to a superficial investigation and precipitate apprehension of things hard to be understood, and which the candidate for (holy) orders is seldom prepared to discuss.....The ardour of the controversialist requires to be moderated, not inflamed; and it is to be regretted that any deviation from the ordinary course of episcopal proceedings should not be calculated to produce that effect." We thought that most wise and good men of all parties—if parties there must be—would have concurred in these sentiments; but to all that is urged on this subject, Mr. Dodgson only replies that he "cannot recognize the principle that a bishop is to be put upon his trial before the public in a matter of which he must himself be considered the fittest judge." Now in this remark there is some truth and some error. A bishop exercises his office of ordaining in a direct and awful responsibility before God; and with this no man can interfere. He is undoubtedly the fittest—indeed, the only—judge of what he considers to be proper qualification in the candidate; but this does not supersede all responsibility to the catholic church, or render him infallible in the detail of his proceedings. If Lord Melbourne were to procure Mr. Sidney Smith to be made a bishop, his ordinations would be valid; and he would be the only judge of what he considered due qualification; but he might not be the fittest judge of what those qualifications ought to be. It is a great mistake to mix up what belongs to the episcopal office with what belongs to the man who holds it. Lord Brougham's chancery decrees (if not reversed) are as valid in law as Lord Eldon's, but they might not be equally well-judged. A bishop may ask unfit questions, or ordain unfit candidates for holy orders. We must not allow either our veneration for the episcopal office, or our respect for the piety, learning, talents, and character of any individual who exercises it, to lead us to confound things which differ. Notwithstanding those matters in these questions which appear to us exceptionable, we never doubted the conscientious solicitude, kindness, and paternal consideration of Bishop Longley, or whomever he should judge worthy of aiding him, in the examination of candidates for the sacred ministry. But this is not the subject of inquiry; nor did we presume or wish to meddle with it. We take certain questions as we find them; and sure we are that there is nothing invidious or improper in forming a sober judgment upon them. The Church of England does not recognize a bishop as the only party concerned in examining candidates for holy orders. The thirty-fifth canon

the actual decision of each case, and the reasons on which it is grounded—these form the proper commentary on the questions, and explain their real object and tendency; and without this evidence, as the case cannot be fairly judged, so neither, as it seems to me, ought it to be discussed. (2.)

---

prescribes that if the bishop personally examines the candidate, he shall do it "in the presence of those ministers that shall assist him at the imposition of hands;" and who shall be "to the number of three at the least;" and if he "shall admit any to sacred orders who is not so qualified and examined," the archbishop "shall suspend the said bishop or suffragan so offending from making either deacons or priests for the space of two years." The Ordination Services rather take for granted that in most cases the candidate is examined by presbyters, and not by the bishop himself; and when, in the course of the service for the Ordination of Deacons, the bishop is directed to "examine every one of them that are to be ordered in the presence of the people," it is "after this manner following;" namely, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration; to serve God for the promoting of his glory and the edifying of his people?" "Do you think that you are truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due order of this realm, to the ministry of the Church?" &c. &c. This kind of examination, if transferred to the bishop's table, would give a young man a very different notion of his solemn obligations to that conveyed by questions about "the Lambeth Articles," and "the conduct of the Calvinistic party."

(2.) If Mr. Dodgson asks whether we would have discussed these questions had a copy of them fallen privately into our hands, we are quite ready to say that we should not; for we shrink from publishing what any man writes or speaks, without his permission. But we are not sure that we do not sometimes carry our scruple too far; and in the case of a code of questions printed for the use of the candidates for ordination of a diocese, there was already that large measure of publicity which might well seem, to many wise and good men, not only to justify, but to require, public notice of any thing peculiarly exceptionable in them. Were Convocation permitted to sit and legislate, discussions in such cases would arise in that body; and these discussions would give far more extensive notoriety to the affair than any pamphlet or periodical publication could do. But these are not the points under consideration. Certain questions are published as ordination questions; they are not denied to be so; they are admitted to be so: but the localities we enter not upon; we only inquire, Are the alleged questions Scriptural, and are they advisable? The press is not very delicate; but Mr. Dodgson will find that the people of England will so far sympathize with it as to say, "If you are not ashamed or afraid of placing the questions in the hands of your candidates for holy orders, you ought not to be ashamed or afraid of their being known generally to the Church. If the doctrines which they contain are Scriptural and proper for the occasion, the publication of the questions will do you honour; but if not, you cannot suppress inquiry by standing upon prerogative." Mr. Dodgson says that the questions "do not fairly represent the examination; an important, and in many cases the most important, part of which is conducted in private." Here he turns the attention of the reader from that which is general and public—namely, the truth of certain doctrines, and the propriety of certain questions—to an inquiry respecting "the conversations between the candidate and the examiner," which we should never have alluded to, even had the whole been taken down in short-

I could not desire a better illustration of these remarks than that which is furnished by the review before me. With the anxious desire, which is manifested throughout, to deal with the subject soberly, impartially, and truly, you have given a representation of the case, which not only the author of the Questions, but any single candidate to whom they were proposed, could have refuted by the most positive testimony. You have assumed throughout that the questions are framed—I do not use the terms in any offensive sense—in a controversial and party spirit. In one place (p. 396) you seem to hint at the particular party to be favoured: but you do not hesitate to name that which was to be attacked; and so entirely does the idea of "catching Calvinists" seem to have taken possession of your mind, that you make it one of the objects of your argument to prove that the questions are calculated to "catch" many who are *not* Calvinists; as though this were inconsistent with their intention. You assume farther that the candidates are required to answer these questions in a particular manner, "on pain of being excluded from orders in the Ripon district of the Anglican church." From these assumptions you very naturally argue that the questions are "unjust;" that they must be felt as a grievance by a particular class of candidates; and that "many of the best clergymen would inevitably be rejected by such an ordeal." (3)

---

hand, and sent to us for comment. Besides, no private conversations or additional questions could alter the fact that the published questions are not what they should be. Does Mr. Dodgson mean that he contradicted in conversation, what Bishop Burnet calls that "most mischievous error" which he asserts in the questions? On the contrary, we must presume that in conversation it would be still more strongly impressed; and the doubting candidate be perplexed, or perhaps be won over to it. Or can any conversation or additional examination disprove the position that it is far from being desirable to connect a fatherly examination respecting the spiritual and mental qualifications of a young man to preach the Gospel, with an inquisition respecting his notions concerning "the Lambeth Articles" and "the conduct of the Calvinistic party?" It would be an indecorous, but not inappropriate reply on the part of the examinant; "I have been endeavouring so to devote my mind and soul to those essential matters whereby I may save myself and them that hear me, that I have had neither time nor taste to inquire much about the conduct of the Calvinists, or the merits or demerits of the Lambeth Articles."

(3) "Catching Calvinists" was not our phrase; on the contrary, we complained of it; because it partakes of the very fault of these questions themselves, namely, that of identifying with Calvinism what is not exclusively Calvinistic, but Anglican and Christian. We expressly stated that though these questions are designed to catch Calvinists, which no man who reads them can doubt; and though moreover this was unlawful, as the Church of England never intended to expel doctrinal Calvinists from her pale; yet that our main objection was that they went beyond this, and, in spite of Bishop Horsley's well known warning, caught not a few sound churchmen, who have as little addiction to the peculiarities of Calvinism, as our correspondent himself.

Mr. Dodgson refers us to the candidates themselves in proof that the questions are not controversial or party-spirited. Here again his argument would draw us from a fair open inquiry, to one private, invidious, and altogether inconclusive; for how can anything that passed in the examination-room alter the plain text

I do not doubt that this *theory* appeared to you to be fairly deducible from the papers before you: but what if the very reverse of it had been already established as a *fact?* what if the questions were framed and proposed without any party views and intentions whatever? what if this was distinctly explained at the time to the candidates, and proved to their entire conviction? what if several among them *did* answer many of the questions in direct contradiction to the views of the examiner? what if those very candidates, after the private examinations and conversations, to which their answers gave rise, were among the first to express their personal sense of the anxiety shown (and, God knows, *felt*) to treat them with kindness and impartiality? what if *not one* of them was excluded? what if, at the close of the business, an unanimous expression of thanks from the whole body

---

of the questions? We assert that they are decidedly controversial; and that they are party-spirited too; for is it not party-spirited for a bishop's chaplain to say to the candidate, "Distinguish between the Calvinistic and Arminian views of predestination. Is the former affirmed by the language of our Articles? Examine this question by considering, 1. The conduct of the Calvinistic party. What alterations and additions did they wish to introduce?" &c. &c. (See the remainder at p. 389 of our Number for June.) Is not this plunging the candidate into the very vortex of party discussions? The propounder of the questions puts himself forth as an advocate for the Arminian party against the Calvinist; and he expects the candidate to prove that the seventeenth article is Arminian, and was intended by the reformers to be so; notwithstanding Burnet himself, and other Arminian expositors, have admitted, that though an Arminian they think may sign it, on the ground that it is not perfectly explicit, it is certainly more favourable to the Calvinist. The very introduction officially of the words Arminian and Calvinist, as a distinction among Churchmen, at a bishop's examination of his candidates, is calculated to give rise to controversy and party-spirit. There is nothing about Calvinism and Arminianism in the Articles or Liturgy of our Church. Mr. Dodgson complains that we assume that the candidate is to answer these questions in a particular manner, upon pain of being rejected. If the questions mean anything, they mean this. The propounder asserts, and expects the candidate to admit and to prove, that such and such are the doctrines of the Church of England. If he maintains the contrary he is disqualified for officiating in her communion; since he does not submit to her doctrines, if those be her doctrines. As mere points of curious controversy such questions are worse than superfluous as ordination queries; it is only as they are supposed to be of high importance that they ought to be propounded at a bishop's examination. When the Examiner says: "Shew, from expressions in the catechism and in the baptismal service, that our Church holds that all infants duly baptized are—1. Justified; 2. Sanctified; but that this change of state does not imply that they will necessarily be saved in the end;" the candidate who feels that he cannot shew what is required, may reasonably infer that he cannot satisfy the propounder of the question; who does not ask, in a neutral form, What is the doctrine of the Church upon such and such subjects? but prove that it is so and so.

Mr. Dodgson says: "You make it one of the objects of your argument, to prove that the questions are calculated to catch many who are *not* Calvinists, as though this were inconsistent with their intention." Our complaint on this head was against the writer of the pamphlet which we were reviewing, and who

was conveyed, in strong and feeling terms, both to the Bishop and the examiner, for the examination itself, and the spirit in which it had been throughout conducted?—you will not, I am persuaded, think that I am speaking boastfully. There is nothing to boast of. The commendation, if my expressions imply any, belongs to the candidates, whose conduct reflected great honour on their feelings. (4.)

I have thus given you one ground upon which you may reason with respect to the real character of these questions. I suggest another in the simple fact that they were coupled with the intentions with which they were written, fully sanctioned by the present Bishop of Ripon—few words, but *φωναντα συνετοισι*. I will now briefly and candidly state what those intentions were. It may not be thought irrelevant to the subject to state, in the outset, what all who know me at all, can testify, that I have never been in any way concerned with religious party or religious controversy. I may partly perhaps regard it as one of the blessings which an obscure and retired life has afforded me; and in the responsible situation which I now hold, I am constantly feeling the comfort of it.

---

is avowedly a Calvinist, rather than against Mr. Dodgson's questions; for the title "Cobwebs to catch Calvinists" either omits a large portion of those who are caught by those questions, or classes them under the word Calvinists. Now Mr. Dodgson uses the word Calvinist only in reference to predestination and final perseverance, where it is appropriate; but Archbishop Laurence, we shewed in that very review, uses it more largely and most unfairly, saying: "The Calvinistical, or, as they rather wish to be termed, the Evangelical clergy;" "men who in their hearts approve of the tenets of Calvin," but, "for reasons best known to themselves, studiously avoid the open avowal of absolute predestination." In this unfair manner, as Bishop Horsley says, many persons aim their shafts at Calvinism; calling the Scriptural and Protestant doctrine of justification by faith Calvinistic; and considering it Calvinistic to doubt whether every infant is justified in baptism, when, by reason of its tender age, it cannot perform faith or repentance. From the tenour of Mr. Dodgson's questions we might have thought it not unlikely that he would agree with divines of this school in thus denouncing, under the name of Calvinism, what is not so; but our only assertion was, that his Calvinistic opponent had made this incorrect identification.

(4.) We are very far indeed from wishing to weaken the force of this paragraph. We can most readily concur in the obvious reply to these *what ifs*; for on the hypothesis of "like bishop, like chaplain," though we did not know Mr. Dodgson's name, much less that it was he who drew up these questions, we could not but have concluded that practically the candidates would meet with kind and anxious consideration. But we spoke of the test of doctrine as laid down in the questions, and not as it may or may not have been practically enforced; and the test of doctrine for candidates thus ascertained is most certainly as we have shewn it to be. The explanation stated to have been given to the young men almost turns the questions into ridicule. For instance: "Shew from expressions in the catechism, and in the baptismal service, that our Church holds that all infants duly baptized are—1, justified; 2, sanctified:—but mind you are not expected to shew any such thing." "Shew from a passage in St. Paul's history, that he himself was not justified until he had been baptized:—but observe, you are at perfect liberty to say there is no such passage." If the candidate, practically, was not expected to shew any such thing, what availed the questions?

If by "catching Calvinists" be meant ascertaining who of the body of candidates entertain Calvinistic opinions, and how far they are disposed to carry them, I have no hesitation in avowing such an intention: but beyond this, what I have already stated shews the charge to be groundless. That doctrinal Calvinists, as they are termed by Bishop Horsley, have been constantly admitted, and are properly admissible, to the ministry of the English Church, no one acquainted with the history of that church would think of denying. But it is equally undeniable that conclusions may be, and have been, deduced from Calvinistic doctrines, which are palpably inconsistent with the express language of the Church. Before, therefore, we incur the responsibility of admitting the doctrinal Calvinist to the ministerial office, we have a right to demand, and, as I conceive, are bound to obtain, a previous security that there is nothing in his views which shall prevent his teaching, in all their simplicity and integrity, the practical doctrines of the Church of England. (5.)

But these questions, as you have justly remarked, do not point at Calvinism alone. There are many points on which it may be desirable to draw forth the opinions of a candidate, which have no necessary connexion with the peculiar opinions of Calvin. Such for example is the important subject of baptism—the key, as I consider it, of the Church of England system. To enter into an exposition or vindication of the views implied in the question upon that subject, and explained to the candidates, would be foreign to the purpose of this letter. I will only say that they are widely different from those

(5.) This paragraph appears to us ambiguous. The writer, however, admits that his express intention was to ascertain which of the candidates held Calvinistic opinions; so that though the phrase of "catching Calvinists," which the pamphlet writer borrowed from the House of Lords, should, we think, have been avoided, as offensive, it proves to have been correct. But Mr. Dodgson adds, that he only wished to know whether the candidates were Calvinists, in order to ascertain "how far they are disposed to carry their Calvinistic opinions," so that he might ascertain that "there is nothing in their views which should prevent their teaching, in all their simplicity and integrity, the practical doctrines of the Church of England." We have said that this is ambiguous, for Mr. Dodgson does not state what are the "practical doctrines," a reluctance to teach which should exclude the candidate from holy orders. Some divines place baptismal justification in the very front of those doctrines; does Mr. Dodgson do so? Would he have degraded Bishop Burnet from his sacred office for calling it the most mischievous error of popery? We cannot ascertain what practical doctrines he refers to. The questions are admitted to be constructed to catch doctrinal Calvinists; yet when "caught," they are not, it appears, to be expelled unless they hold some other opinions "inconsistent with the express language of the Church." But why not then inquire at once respecting those opinions, whatever they may be? If Calvinism is so innocent that those who hold it are "properly admissible to the ministry of the Church," but certain other doctrines are a disqualification, why pass over these doctrines, and "level your shafts against Calvinism?" Why not drop an invidious appellation, and go at once to the real object of the inquiry. The candidates did not go to Yorkshire to retail their opinions about Calvinism and Arminianism, but to give proof whether they were sincere and well qualified members of the Anglican portion of Christ's Catholic Church.

which the reviewer supposes. To the *inference* that the doctrine of justification by faith only is "set aside" by them, I would simply oppose the *fact* that justification by faith *only, as excluding justification by works,* has even been enforced at these examinations as a main pillar of Gospel truth, and an essential doctrine of the Church of England. Whether this doctrine excludes also the supposition of *any* being admitted into covenant with Christ, and so justified, *except* such as are capable of faith and works, is a question which I do not mean here to discuss. But if any candidate had expressed a doubt as to the intention of the Church in this respect, I can assure you that he would have been referred not to the Fathers, nor to the Church of Rome, but simply to his own Prayer-book: to the declaration, for instance, with respect to infants baptized privately, and without any previous sponsorial promise, that they "being born in the wrath of God are now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, received into the number of the children of God and heirs of everlasting life," and so "dying" in their infancy "are undoubtedly saved." And if, with these words before him, he could have fairly proved that the Church considered that such infants are either born in a justified, or die in an unjustified state, or finally that their passage from the one of these states to the other is not connected with "the laver of regeneration in baptism," it would have been perfectly open to him to do so. (6.)

(6.) This paragraph is ambiguous like the last. When points of doctrine occur, our correspondent says he does not mean to discuss them; nay, he gives no opinion upon them. To what purpose, then, is his letter, since it was precisely upon these points that we complained of the questions? He says that his views of baptism are "widely different from those which the reviewer supposes." Why not have mentioned in what we had mistaken them? This would have been the best reply to our statements; and if we were wrong, it would have been consoling to us to have been shown our error. But in truth, we only took the questions as we found them, and presented them to our readers, suggesting a few remarks upon them; and though in an examination-room it is enough for the examiner to make a statement, yet, in the wide world, when two writers make opposite statements, readers ask for proofs; and they will not be satisfied with Mr. Dodgson's assertion that we have misinterpreted his questions without his shewing where and how we have done so.

He says, "To the inference that the doctrine of justification by faith only is set aside by them (the Ripon questions), I would simply oppose the fact that justification by faith only, as excluding justification by works, has ever been enforced at these examinations as a main pillar of Gospel truth, and an essential doctrine of the Church of England." Now we do most strongly complain of this assertional, unexplained, reply to our statement, and we confidently request the manly, straight-forward, truth-loving Bishop of Ripon to be the referee in this important matter. We have had occasion several times to show the deceptiveness of the Oxford Tract writers upon this very point, and we are sorry to be obliged again to recur to the subject.

The Papists asserted two justifications, the first by faith, the second by works; the first through baptism, the second through the Lord's Supper and other means of grace, in connexion with holy works. It is to the first that we confine our attention; for though Mr. Dodgson's system *implies* the second, in order to restore the loss of justification consequent upon deadly sin after bap-

Briefly then, the object of the questions to which you have referred, was to ascertain the degree of attention which the candidate had paid to the authorized formularies of his church: to lead him to compare his own interpretations of a deduction from Scripture with

---

tism, he has not gone into that part of the subject, and has thus left a blank which popery rightly decided it was necessary to fill. But of the first, or baptismal justification, the Council of Trent teaches that all persons duly receiving baptism (infants included, seeing they place no obstacle to grace) are justified and sanctified; and that this is by faith only, without human works or merit. The seventh chapter of the sixth session is very explicit on this subject. "The causes," it says, "of justification are these; the final cause, the glory of God and of Christ, and life eternal: the efficient cause, the merciful God who clearly cleanses and sanctifies, sealing and anointing with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance; the meritorious cause, his well-beloved and only-begotten son Jesus Christ our Lord, who through his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were enemies, merited justification for us by his most holy passion on the cross, and made satisfaction for us to God the father; *the instrumental cause, the sacrament of baptism, which is the* SACRAMENT OF FAITH, without which no one can ever obtain justification." Here then it is clear that a man who asserts justification in baptism does not prove that he is not Tridentine in his notion merely by saying that the justification is free, unmerited, through Christ as the procuring cause, and through faith, as distinguished from good works, but as connected with "the sacrament of faith." The Papists say all this of baptismal justification as strongly as Mr. Dodgson can do; but then they make a second justification by works; that is, as Mr. Knox and the Oxford Tracts teach, by the new nature infused in baptism doing its duty, and so working out salvation. The Reformers denied this double justification; they knew but of one justification, and that through faith, and not by works; though justifying faith, they maintained, is necessarily productive of good works. Such is most clearly the doctrine of the Church of England.

In process of time the question, as between us and the Papists, began to be very much overlooked, and the dispute about faith and works took a somewhat different turn. If we revert to the days of Whitfield and Wesley, we shall find that the great charge against those "enthusiasts," as they were called, was that they preached justification by faith instead of by works; the majority of the clergy denouncing the doctrine of justification by faith as hostile to the interests of morality. In this shape the dispute came down to the present century. Our clergy had nearly lost sight of the true Protestant Scriptural doctrine; and though they did not generally urge the Romanist's distinction of a first justification in baptism and a second by good works, yet in effect their preaching amounted to this; justificati n, though not under that name, being virtually included in baptism. The practice was not then common of using the language of Scripture, and of our own Articles, but of appropriating the justification by faith predicated in them to baptism; infants being included on the Tridentine ground that baptism is "the sacrament of faith," and stands in the place of it where no obstacle is interposed. On the contrary, the clergy very generally disclaimed altogether the doctrine of justification by faith, and earnestly exhorted men to justify themselves by good living. They in fact adopted the Papist's second justification, losing sight of his first.

At length, however, the labours of those who espoused the real doctrine of the Reformation, and their constant reference to the Scriptures, and the formularies

those propounded in the language, which he would be bound ministerially to use, and thus to mark the limits within which his views must be confined: to suggest views, which might not have occurred to him before, on points of difficulty: to "catch," if you wish, his Calvinism, or, it might be, his Arminianism, and to ascertain in what

---

of the Church, led to a clearer understanding of this momentous truth; and blessed be God, not a few of our clergy adopted it in its Scriptural simplicity. Then arose a struggle, and the watchword was justification by faith, or justification by works. The difference was well defined; and no person could doubt which opinion a preacher embraced.

But of late, and chiefly by means of the Oxford Tract writers, a change has come over our theology, so that Protestant words do not always carry a Protestant meaning. The divines alluded to speak as clearly as the Canon of Trent, of justification freely without human merit, through the merits of Christ, excluding good works; but, like the Council of Trent, they attach justification exclusively to baptism; so that a man is justified, not because personally he has faith, but because he was unconsciously subjected in his infancy to "the sacrament of faith;"—as if, by the way, baptism is not a work, as much as alms-giving or partaking of the Lord's Supper. Having observed that the public are led astray by this deceptive use of words, naturally supposing that when a man says that we are justified by faith only, as excluding justification by works, he means by the assertion what Protestants have always meant by it, and not what Rome means, against whose meaning we protest; that he means justification by the actual faith of the individual, and not justification in infancy by vicarious faith; we have of late usually tried to make our meaning unambiguous by some explanatory phrase; and this we actually did in our notice of Mr. Dodgson's questions; for we said (p. 390), "But these questions include much that is *not* Calvinism; for never can we admit that *the Scriptural doctrine of justification by faith*, AS HELD BY PROTESTANTS, is Calvinistic." The words "as held by Protestants" were expressly inserted to distinguish the holding of Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans, from the holding of the Church of Rome and of our new via-media divines. We shewed that the Ripon questions do not assert the doctrine of justification by faith as held by the Church of England; for they predicate justification of infants in baptism, whereas our Church says that infants "cannot perform" faith any more than repentance. Now how does Mr. Dodgson attempt to get over this difficulty? Why, by asserting what he calls "a fact," in reply to our "inference." He does, he says, teach justification by faith only, as excluding justification by works. We never doubted this. The Oxford Tracts do so; and the Church of Rome does so. Yet our Reformers had earnest contests with Rome on this very subject; and we lately quoted Hooker's admirable remarks upon it, shewing how far Rome goes with us, and where she turns off into the bye-paths of error. But Mr. Dodgson leaves out our emphatic words "*as held by Protestants*," and gives, *without explanation*, "a fact" which, *if explained*, would shew that our statement was perfectly correct. He might just as truly say that the Tridentine Council agreed with Luther that justification by faith is the prime doctrine by which the Church must stand or fall; for it did so, if sacramental justification be meant. We have a great abhorrence of such ambiguities. Let us clearly understand one another.

There are three systems which are at this moment contending for the mastery among the clergy of the Church of England—Mysticism, Legalism, and Scriptural Protestantism. The first delights, as Rome did, to resolve religion into

manner it affected his practical views of Christian truth: but all this with the ulterior purpose of obtaining a ground-work and a guide for *private* examinations and conversations, and of judging, not from his answers to this or that particular question, but from the general result of his entire examination, whether there were good reason to hope that he would prove a faithful and consistent teacher of the doctrines of the Church of England. (7.)

---

an affair of unintelligible mystery; the sacraments themselves, which were given to us by our Divine Lord in mercy, as "means of grace," outward and visible signs and seals of spiritual benefits, being made to convey what the Church of Rome calls *a character*, nobody knows how, and it would be irreverent, say the Oxford Tract divines, to inquire; only thus much are we told, that they do not operate through faith, or through the exercise of the intellectual faculties combined with the spiritualized affections of the heart; but in a Bellarmine *ex opere operato* manner; the manner which the priests of Rome invented, in order to enrich their own coffers, and to lord it over the prostrate souls of men.

We can well believe that some conscientious and devout men have taken up this system of fanaticism in order to escape from the second error which we mentioned—namely, legalism. The mysterious system recognizes grace, and faith, and Divine influence, which were well-nigh forgotten by those divines who urged moral obedience as the agent of justification; though in the end it verges to the same result; for if justification is by baptism in infancy through the vicarious faith of the Church, it is plainly seen that, to avoid licentiousness, another justification, not vicarious, not through faith only but by works,—works moral, works sacramental, and so forth,—must be insisted upon; so that with the fanaticism of the Romish school upon the subject of the sacraments, is blended its legalism in making our final justification after all to be of works, and not of faith that it may be by grace.

But why not avoid both these errors by teaching the plain Scriptural Protestant doctrine? telling men that they must be justified by faith only, in virtue of the meritorious obedience unto death of Jesus Christ (not thereby secretly meaning that they are already justified, while unconscious, by vicarious faith in baptism), but that their faith must be that true and living faith which produces holy works, and all the virtues and excellencies of the Christian character. Here grace is magnified, while the interests of virtue are secured; here St. Paul coalesces with St. James; here is justification by faith without solifidianism or antinomianism; and here is a guarantee for good works, without Pharisaism or the arrogance of self-justification.

(7.) This explanation relates to what we have no right or wish to interfere with —the private intentions and proceedings of the examiner. It was not necessary, in order "to ascertain the degree of attention which the candidate had paid to the authorized formularies of the Church," and so forth, that the examination should be controversial, or thrown into the form of leading or tentative questions. Mr. Dodgson himself states, in the next paragraph, that "in most cases a simple affirmation or negative will be sufficient;" so that "in most cases," by his own shewing, the questions are *not* calculated "to ascertain the degree of attention which the candidate has paid to the authorized formularies of the Church;" but only whether he is willing to say Yes or No to what he discerns to be the interpretation of the examiner. The code forms a continued theological argument; so that even in those cases in which a question is not directly a leading question, it is rendered so by the context, which supposes the reply to have been given in a

Undoubtedly the form of many of the questions implies the opinions held by the proposer: indeed in the paper for Deacons it may be plainly seen that a sort of connected argument runs through them. But this paper was prefaced by the following special directions :—

"Each of these questions is to be dealt with in the following manner:—

"1. Write down the question with a short and distinct answer. In most cases a simple affirmative or negative will be sufficient.

"2. When the nature of the question admits of it, prove the orthodoxy of your statement by quotations from the public formularies of the Church of England.

"3. Shew by quotations from the Bible that the doctrine of the Church is scriptural." (8).

This gives, as you will admit, a different tone and character to the paper; and one which I believe was fully understood. The candidate was not "addictus jurare in verba magistri." It was open to him to prove, if he was able to do so, that the view of the Church was a different one. (9.)

---

particular manner. One of our express objections to the questions is, that they are *not* calculated "to ascertain the degree of attention which the candidate has paid to the authorized formularies of the Church;" for he might reply to many of them in almost utter ignorance of those formularies. If a Cambridge examiner were to say, "Does not Lagrange give a theorem on the maxima and minima of functions of two variables?" it would not be necessary that the examinee should ever have read Lagrange, or heard of his theorem, or of variables, or their maxima and minima, in order to reply with "a simple affirmative." Where the real knowledge and opinions of a candidate are intended to be elicited, without their receiving any bias from those of the examiner, questions are not framed in this manner.

(8.) These directions are excellent in themselves; but as connected with the avowedly systematic character of the questions, they only mean in effect, "Say Yes to my statement; and prove its orthodoxy." Mr. Dodgson says: "In the paper for deacons it may be plainly seen that a sort of connected argument runs through them." Precisely so; and therefore if a young man cannot take the first step, he is baffled throughout; and it would appear excessively arrogant in him to go on quoting Scripture and the Church formularies to contradict instead of verifying the "orthodoxy" of his examiner's statements.

(9.) But what an invidious task was this; and what hope could the most pious, learned, and highly qualified candidate have, that he should be admitted into the ministry of the Church of England in the diocese of Ripon, if he plainly saw that he was contradicting what the Bishop's chaplain accounted its whole spirit and system. Bishop Marsh very fairly and explicitly told his candidates what they had to expect; for he said, in his "Directions for answering the Questions," that "the answers must be full, clear, and unequivocal, in order that the Bishop may know whether the doctrines of the candidate are in *perfect unison* with the doctrines of the Church [as interpreted by Dr. Marsh]; and therefore whether he is fit for admission to an office in the Church." It was added, "If any question remains unanswered, or receives *an unsatisfactory answer*, it may tend to their exclusion from the sacred office;" so that if a young man should say, "I feel it presumptuous to attempt to give a perfectly decided opinion upon some of the intricate points involved in these questions, which have divided the most learned and judicious theologians," he was not to be accounted "fit for admission

The answers thus elicited were, as might have been expected, various in character: but the real views of the candidates were ascertained. Private interviews followed, with much interesting, and I trust not unprofitable, conversation. The plan fully answered its intended purpose: its results have been already described.

If it be said that what I have stated could not have been gathered from the printed questions, I answer as before, that this is precisely the argument by which I would shew that such matters are not subjects for public criticism. The whole case, as I have said, is not before the public. The parties immediately concerned are alone acquainted with it, and alone competent to form a fair judgment of it. (10.)

I cannot but regret that you had not an opportunity of consulting an *authentic* copy of the questions. You would have given, I feel assured, a fairer account of them. You would have stated that they did not form above a sixth part of even the examination on paper: you would not have omitted the printed directions which I have transcribed above: nor would you have failed to state that the first exercise proposed, and on which of course much depended, was the composition of a sermon on one of the following texts:—Rom. viii. 1; 1 John ii. 1; Tit. ii. 13; Acts xx. 27; John xix. 30; John iii. 16; you might perhaps have added that the selection of these texts did not savour of a Popish or sectarian spirit. (11.)

---

to an office in the Church;" and much less if, instead of giving no decided opinion, he inclined to one contrary to the interpretation of the examiner. Mr. Dodgson says that this practical conclusion has not followed in the diocese of Ripon; and we are glad of it; but why then hold out the questions—if we may say it inoffensively—*in terrorem?* About five-and-twenty years ago the present amiable and charitable Bishop of Bath and Wells, then at Chester, rejected two most excellent and highly qualified candidates, who afterwards became much esteemed and valued clergymen, because, in answer to some such question as that of Mr. Dodgson respecting "the Calvinistic and Arminian view" of some doctrine, they inclined to the former. His Lordship, we thought at the time, acted consistently; for if the question was of sufficient moment to require close inquisition into a young man's sentiments upon it, it was not a matter of indifference whether he said Yes or No. His Lordship was then a junior on the Episcopal bench; but he soon discovered, and acted with his usual kindness and forbearance upon the discovery, that neither a Bishop nor his chaplain can bring all the clergy to his own way of thinking, however clearly to himself he may have demonstrated his system in his charges or ordination questions.

(10.) Surely any theological scholar is competent to form "a fair judgment" of the plan and purport of a series of questions, which the proposer himself says constitute "a sort of connected argument." No private explanation can alter the obvious *animus* of the written and printed interrogations.

(11.) We neither procured, nor wished to procure, privately, a copy of the questions. It was only as the matter came before us publicly among the pamphlets and controversies of the day, that we touched upon it; and we expressly said, "We will quote all that we find in the pamphlet;" we neither added nor kept back. It was quite clear that no addition or explanation could alter the extracts given to the world; unless the examiner had affixed a note, saying: "I have assumed that my 'connected argument' exhibits a correct view of

But I feel that I have said enough for the purpose of this letter. I will not, however, lose the opportunity of noticing very briefly one or two errors in the details of the subject, into which you have inadvertently fallen.

In p. 395 the emphasis on the word "every" in question XI. is represented as implying a view which no one would more heartily abjure than myself. The question was at the examination universally answered in the affirmative, *as I had hoped it would be.* (12.)

Scriptural and Anglican doctrine; and that the candidate is of that opinion; but this is only for the sake of argument; and it will not be any disparagement to him if he says Yes, where I say No, and vice versâ." The sermon required upon the well-selected texts mentioned in this paragraph, was an admirable exercise; but why degenerate from such a hopeful beginning by going on to "catch Calvinists;" and to ask for crude notes on the Lambeth Articles? We assure Mr. Dodgson that we approve of the Lambeth Articles as little as he can do; they are harsh and unscriptural; for where do we find in the word of God such language as that in the fourth of them, "Those who are not predestinated to salvation, shall inevitably be damned for their sins;" or in the ninth, "It is not in the will or power of every man to be saved;" and so on of others. But as little do we concur in what Mr. Dodgson calls the Arminian, and, as he considers, the Anglican view of predestination; which Archbishop Laurence, in his Bampton Lectures, defines to be "a general election of all who by baptism in their infancy, or by faith and obedience in maturer years, become the adopted heirs of Heaven." Where do we read anything of this sort in Scripture? Some Romanists believe that God elected those who he foresaw would perform meritorious works; the Arminian (so called), or rather the English Arminian, holds the same, only substituting the word *good* for *meritorious;* the Calvinist says—and so far we consider the Lambeth Articles truly scriptural—that the favour of God to us was not in virtue of goodness foreseen. Do what they may, neither Mr. Dodgson, nor Archbishop Laurence, nor any other advocate of the doctrine of obedience foreseen, can prevent its verging towards the popish doctrine of merit; and as for Calvin's "horribile decretum," what can be more terrible than Archbishop Laurence's doctrine, (we quote his Grace, because he has just republished his Bampton Lectures) that election refers only to baptized children and obedient adults; the inference from which is, that non-baptized infants, as the priests of Rome cruelly teach, are lost.

(12.) The question alluded to (namely, the 11th, to Deacons) is: "In *every* case does he need a constant renewal and increase of the grace given in baptism?" The precise word "grace" had not occurred in the previous questions; but the compiler had stated that "the change in this relation and in this condition [the relation and condition of 'men by nature'] is implied by the words justification and sanctification;" and that these "take place at baptism when that sacrament is rightly administered and rightly received," as in the case of infants. He had also just asked, "Can a regenerate person fall from the state of salvation in which he has been placed by baptism?" Taking then these definitions of "the grace given in baptism," the affirmative answer to the eleventh question will run, "In every case he needs a constant renewal and increase of justification, sanctification, regeneration, and being placed in a state of salvation;" which reply involves the Romanist error of a constant renewal and increase of justification; and Mr. Dodgson has thus forced every candidate to affirm this. The tenth chapter of the decrees of Trent upon justification, is expressly entitled "Of the

The question, whether good works are the *cause* or the *consequence* of Christian privileges, does not, in your opinion, admit of a categorical reply, *because* the candidate might say that one of the privileges of a believer is to be created by God unto good works. Undoubtedly he might do so; and if he were to add, 'and therefore those good works must be the *consequence* of that spiritual creation,' I should not desire a more satisfactory answer. (13.)

---

increase of justification received" (that is, in the sacrament of baptism); and it says that "those who are justified" "increase in the justification which they received by the grace of Christ, and are more justified by the observance of the commands of God and the Church, faith co-operating with good works;" which corresponds to Mr. Dodgson's next question of the means "to be used after baptism, whereby grace may be renewed and increased." The eleventh question is so worded, that if answered in the affirmative it brings out this doctrine: and if in the negative it implies Mr. Newman's doctrine, which we are glad to find Mr. Dodgson "heartily abjures," that there are baptized persons who grow up so immaculately, that "they literally do not know the power or misery of sin." We repeat, however, that the Italic emphasis upon the word "every," according to all established usage, leads, though the proposer of the questions did not mean it, to a reply in the negative; for if we say, "Has every man his price?" we merely ask the question; but if we say, "Has *every* man his price?" we cause the voice to take the circumflex accent upon "every," as though we said, "What! do you allow *no* exception to Sir R. Walpole's degrading estimate?—had Andrew Marvell *his* price?"

But whether answered negatively or affirmatively, the question leads to a wrong result; and the error arises from the adoption of the Romanist notion that the sacraments impress a character upon the recipient: (the Council of Trent, Session vii., in its canons on the sacraments, anathematises those who say that in Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, "there is not impressed upon the soul *a character*, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign;") or that, according to another illustration, a stock of justification and sanctification is bestowed in baptism, to enable the recipient to work out his salvation under the mitigated provisions of a remedial law. We will not go farther into the subject; but it is obvious that the young candidate who answers such questions off-hand, is not likely to be aware of all that is couched in them.

(13.) This answer to our objection is not satisfactory. The Scriptural and Anglican doctrine is that good works are "the *fruits* of faith" (Article XII.), whereas Mr. Newman and the other Oxford Tract writers assert that they are "the instrumental *cause* of faith." We intimated that we did not believe that the Bishop of Ripon (we must now substitute his Lordship's chaplain) meant to affirm that good works are the cause of faith; but our objection to the question amounted to this, that by the substitution of the general phrase "the believer's Christian privileges," for the specific word "faith," the question could not, with theological correctness, be answered *either* way; for as being created to good works is not the cause of the believer's privileges, so neither is it the consequence of those privileges, for it is one of those privileges—and a privilege cannot be its own consequence. Mr. Dodgson's reply does not meet this objection; it slips beside. It makes the candidate give an answer which, in effect, stultifies the question; and then this answer is accepted, as though it were exactly what the examiner meant. But in so doing he is obliged (we do not mean dishonestly,

Quoting the 8th question respecting sponsors, you ask, "Against what class of opinions is this singular question directed?" I answer, against no "class" whatever. The question was inserted, because the solitary opinion to which it alludes, is one which I have not unfrequently heard maintained; and I happen to know that it has proved to some persons a source of much difficulty and discomfort. (14.)

---

but illogically) to alter the terms of the reply; but no alteration can make a privilege its own consequence. Mr. Dodgson speaks, in the aggregate, of the believer's privileges; and whether he make the creation to good works to be the cause or the consequence of them, he excludes it from being part and parcel of them, which Scripture describes it to be. We have said that the reply which he accepts stultifies his own question, and it could not therefore have been intended as the real reply; and it is brought forward to answer our objection, without observing how it bears upon the original question. Mr. Dodgson does not wish a more satisfactory answer, he says, than that good works are a consequence of our spiritual creation; and certainly it is a very excellent answer; but then it makes him ask also whether they are the cause of our spiritual creation; that is, whether the results of regeneration are the cause of regeneration—a question which it could not be necessary to ask. We do not, however, wish to be hypercritical, as Mr. Dodgson has stated what he means; we only intend to shew that we did not hastily criticise his words.

(14.) This reply is more unsatisfactory than any of the foregoing. Mr. Dodgson quotes us as asking what "class" of opinions is question 8th directed against; and then answers, against no "class," but against a "solitary" opinion, which he has heard maintained, and which is to many persons "a source of much difficulty and discomfort." This is his only reply to all our remarks upon this question, and our inquiries as to its meaning (p. 395, 396), as if it were enough that it does not allude to a "class" of opinions, but only to a "solitary" opinion. This parrying off a question is not answering an objection. Our inquiry was, what opinion, or what kind or class of opinions, the question had reference to. We said, "What is its object?" "Against what class of opinions is this singular question directed? What practical error [observe, not errors, or class of errors, but solitary error] is it meant to oppose?" We varied our words in order to get at the truth. We asked, Was it against some class of opinions; or if not, against what solitary "error?" Now Mr. Dodgson keeps out of sight our varied phraseology, our array of singulars and plurals, classes and solitaries; and affects to answer our question by saying, No "class" at all, as if that were the pith and point of our argument. We cared not whether the question referred to a solitary opinion or to a class of opinions; all that we asked was, what is its drift? However, since Mr. Dodgson thus puts us off with an irrelevant answer, we beg leave to rejoin, first, that the question, being part of a series of questions which he says constitute a sort of "connected argument," could not be supposed to be a mere solitary, interjected interrogation, unconnected with what went before or after it; and secondly, that in point of fact it does *not* relate to a solitary opinion; but, as we now gather from his statement respecting the difficulty and discomfort which many persons feel upon the subject, it relates to that very "class" of opinions upon baptism which is upheld in these questions; and so far from being detached and solitary, it was quite necessary to be asked; for though those who believe that men are justified through faith—faith wrought in their own hearts, not the vicarious faith of the Church imputed to them in

In question 4, to Priests, I confess an inadvertency. I suppose, though I have no distinct recollection on the point, that when I added

---

baptism—cannot discern any "difficulty" as respects their justification, because their parents or sponsors were not believers; we can easily perceive, that according to the "class" of opinions held by Mr. Dodgson, this presents a source of very serious difficulty and discomfort; for, as none can be justified without faith, if we relegate our justification to our baptism in infancy, it is a very serious inquiry by whose faith we were justified; and particularly whether our sponsors exercised faith.

The question is as follows: "Would the language of our services for infant baptism warrant us in affirming that the effect of baptism is so connected with the *personal faith* and the intention of the parents or sponsors, as that a defect on their part will necessarily invalidate the Sacrament, and render ineffectual *the prayers of the Church offered in faith* on the child's behalf." Now those who think that a man is justified by his own faith, and not vicariously by the supererogated faith of the Church, can have no fear that a true believer will be rejected because some other persons were not believers when he was baptized in his infancy. But the part of the question to which we chiefly directed the attention of the reader, was that of vicarious faith. Mr. Dodgson says that we are justified in baptism; he says also that we are justified by faith; but infants cannot perform faith and repentance; who then exercises this faith by which they are justified? Not, he says, the parents or sponsors, but it is either the faith of the officiating clergyman, or a sort of corporate vicarious imputed faith, called "the faith of the Church;" for the expression is ambiguous, "the prayers of the Church offered in faith." We asked in our review of the questions, whose faith is meant; for it is not the "personal faith" of the sponsors or parents: nor, as we suppose, the "personal faith" of the clergyman: whose then is it? Mr. Dodgson has declined answering this inquiry. We only ask what reply he would give to a candidate who respectfully requested an explanation of the terms of the question.

We hope that our readers have not imagined that the phrase "vicarious faith" is ours; it is Dr. Pusey's, who has treated upon this subject of justification by the faith of the Church imputed for righteousness, with an anti-protestant boldness which almost rivals the Declaration of the Catechism of Trent, that "In eo vero, summa Dei bonitas et clementia maximis laudibus et gratiarum actionibus prædicanda est, qui humanæ imbecillitati hoc condonavit, ut unus [not Christ, but a mortal like ourselves] posset pro altero satisfacere." The Church of Rome teaches that the Church or individuals may accumulate a stock of merit, which may be transferred to others. The Oxford Tracts drop the phrase "vicarious merit," and say only "vicarious faith." One of the running titles of Dr. Pusey's treatise on Baptism is "Benefits of the faith of others;" and this not only in that "the faith of the Church" (this is his phrase) is imputed to a child in baptism for justification; and that the faith of believers causes unbelievers to bring their children to baptism, so that the child becomes endued with a heavenly nature, though the parents intended nothing of the kind: but, adds Professor Pusey, "I would not by any means limit it to this; for we know not how, or why, or to what extent, the faith of the Church is acceptable in God's sight." The learned Professor goes on to shew the "mighty ends" of this "vicarious faith;" but omits what Dr. Wiseman would say is the most important of them all, the deliverance of souls from purgatory. Dr. Wiseman needs not however be offended, as the Oxford Professor considers that the prayer of faith may benefit departed spirits.

the latter part, I had forgotten that the reference was confined to the catechism and baptismal service.

Dr. Pusey is as determined as Mr. Dodgson that the advocates for the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, as opposed to the doctrine of sacramental justification, shall not gain anything by the case of infants; for he says that not only is there imparted to them "the first *principle* of every heavenly grace, *faith*, love, hope," but that if, besides the "first principle," and the "vicarious faith" of the Church, "faith (itself) be necessary in them, undoubtedly they have this also!" The adult may have justifying faith though he has no good works; and an infant may have not only "the principle" of faith, but actual faith, though he has no apparent development of the "mental energies." Well may Professor Pusey agree with Mr. Dodsworth that it requires strong faith to believe these things. He instances, as an illustration of the sacramental efficacy of baptism, the alleged case of a buffoon, who became converted to Christianity while mimicking baptism upon the stage. All this comes of the doctrine of justification by the vicarious faith of the Church in baptism. We are almost ready to exclaim with Calvin: "Magis consentaneum est incantationibus magicis, quam sanæ Evangelii doctrinæ."

We now take our leave of this afflicting discussion. If it has given pain to Mr. Dodgson it has given still greater pain to us. His letter is so obliging and candid that our first wish and intention was to insert it without one word of comment; but we found that we could not in conscience do so, as the matters at issue are too important to be sacrificed to a love of passive quiet, or conventional courtesy. We have used plain words, especially in shewing the alliance of some of the Ripon questions with Tridentine Romanism;—not, however, as intending to imply that Mr. Dodgson means to espouse any of the errors of Popery; but only as saying that the system which he has embraced is not the genuine doctrine of our Scriptural Protestant Anglican Reformation, but is grounded on that second system which was substituted for it by a class of divines, who have never ceased, from the days of Archbishop Laud, to those of Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, to inveigh against what they consider the ultraism of our original revolt from the Church of Rome. Mr. Keble has with much candour admitted this change, this reformation backwards, which moderated in practice the alleged over-heat of our first Reformers; though unhappily, as Dr. Pusey laments, our authorised formularies were not duly elevated to the standard thus introduced after the delirium of the reformation had subsided. We have for instance an article which teaches the doctrine of justification by faith without the slightest allusion to baptism; and in the inferences to which the Oxford tracts push the fact and the doctrine of our apostolical succession, Mr. Keble frankly states that he is of "the school of Laud" as opposed to "the school of Hooker," that is, to the school—if schools we must have, where there ought to be no school but that of Christ—of our reformers and martyrs. The praise of the diocese of York has long been in all the churches, on account of the wide prevalence of the pure doctrines of the Reformation, with their blessed fruits of piety and charity, in its towns and parishes. The names of Sheffield, and Huddersfield, and Leeds, and Halifax, have been for many years pronounced with honour, wherever the doctrines of our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, in their Scriptural and Protestant interpretation, were loved and venerated; but if, in the infant diocese of Ripon, Dr. Hook's new school at Leeds is to prevail; and justification by vicarious faith, the cumulative "faith of the Church," that figment of popery and mysticism, is to supersede the true Anglican doctrine of justification by a genuine and lively

I will only add in conclusion, that, as this letter has not as yet been seen by the Bishop of Ripon, I alone am answerable for its contents.

---

faith, which unites the believer to Christ, not in outward profession only, but in spirit and in truth, and prompts to all holy thoughts, words, and deeds; the glory will have departed, and not a few parishes which have been blessed with an extensive revival of primitive piety, will revert to the spiritual somnolency of the last century. It is not the truly laudable and admirable zeal, self-denial, and devotion of a few exemplary individuals, which can ultimately prevent this direful result. Without the doctrine of justification by faith a parish cannot flourish as the garden of the Lord; and this doctrine we still deny that Mr. Dodgson holds, since he maintains that we are justified by a vicarious *work*; for bringing a child to baptism is a work; a good work indeed, and a work, when rightly performed, of faith and obedience; but still a work, and a work respecting which there is not one line of holy writ to prove that it carries with it imputed righteousness.

Once more craving pardon for the freedom of our remarks, we return our thanks to Mr. Dodgson for his obliging communication; and we shall be most ready to correct our error if we have after all mistaken any points of difference between us. The discussion is very far from being disparaging to him, unless upon the untenable ground that every Bishop's chaplain is expected to be infallible. We honour his zeal, and the evidently anxious attention which he has devoted to his important duty in examining the candidates for holy orders; there is nothing lax, self-sparing, or perfunctory in his discharge of this solemn undertaking; and though some of his questions appear to us sectional, we feel assured that he accounts them Anglican; so that what *in effect* we consider to be party-spirited we cheerfully acknowledge to be *in motive* honest and catholic. As to the questions, they must be judged of abstractedly, but the discussion does not diminish our respect for the proposer. If he will send us simply a few texts of holy writ upon which he grounds his conclusions respecting the doctrines which we have alluded to, we pledge ourselves to insert them without one word of comment. Can we say more fairly than this? We differ as to the interpretation of our church formularies; and we may quote and argue through a volume, without arriving at any common result; but will he favour us with some of those passages of holy writ upon which he grounds *his* interpretation; if he will, our readers shall not lose the benefit of the information. Or, to bring all to one point, without quoting fathers or any other human authority, will he furnish us, without exposition, with those texts which he would quote to a candidate for holy orders, who wished to know where the Scriptures teach the doctrine of vicarious justification in baptism. We do not put the request in the form of a challenge; very far from it; it is an appeal to one who, we feel assured, is conscientiously convinced himself; and if by the word of God he can convince us, we shall rejoice to acknowledge our mistake, and to follow wherever the sacred text may lead us. It is of little importance to any of us what our fellow-creatures may think of our opinions, and the time is not far distant when it will be of no importance at all; but the word of God is true, and abideth for ever, and to this, under the guidance of its divine Author, should be our appeal.

If our reverend correspondent would peruse the Oxford Tracts, or the Remains of the late Rev. R. Froude, fellow of Oriel College, and one of the contributors to them, he would see, in the legal, self-torturing, and unevangelical system, developed theoretically in the former and practically in the latter, enough to make us extremely anxious, he may think morbidly so, upon some of the subjects touched

Should you do me the honour of inserting it in your next Number, may I request that it may be printed entire?

I remain, Sir, your faithful and obedient servant,

Daresbury near Warrington, CHARLES DODGSON.
June 20, 1838.

---

upon in our notes on his paper; especially as regards the early impressions made upon the minds of academical students and candidates for holy orders. Mr. Froude, in writing to his confidential colleague, questions "whether justification by faith is an integral part of the doctrine necessary to salvation." He wished to get rid of it, but did not well know how; not perhaps recollecting that he could practically do so by resolving it into infant baptism. He and his friends, he confessed, found some difficulty in executing their plans of renovating Anglican doctrine and practice, because, he says, "that odious protestantism sticks in people's gizzards;" and we gather from some remarks inserted by the well known Oxford-divine who edits his Remains, that one of the most indigestible things for these Oriel theologians, is our having "too few sacraments;" particularly not having the sacrament of penance to restore or perfect the first justification of vicarious faith in baptism in which the child is "washed with holy water." All this is consistent; but it is totally unscriptural and fearfully delusive. The battle of the Reformation must be fought once more, where Luther, and Cranmer, and Jewell, and the other Protestant leaders fought it, upon this question of justification by faith, and not by "holy water." We doubt not that Mr. Dodgson feels far greater reverence for those names than did Mr. Froude, who says: "As to the Reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewell was what you would in these days call an irreverent Dissenter. His *Defence of his Apology* disgusted me more than almost any work I ever read." And again: "Why do you praise Ridley? Do you know sufficient good about him to counterbalance the fact that he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, and Bucer? N.B. How beautifully the Edinburgh Review has shown up Luther, Melancthon, and Co.! What good genius has possessed them to do our dirty work?" Alas! it was no good genius; and "dirty work" too truly it was, though gilded over by the tasteful colouring of a Pusey, a Keble, a Hook, or a Newman; and if it be necessary to have nets "to catch Calvinists," it is quite as requisite to have them to catch those who adopt anti-protestant doctrines. As to the harsh language, whether of Mr. Froude or the writer of the hyper-calvinistic pamphlet on the Ripon Questions, it can only recoil on the cause which it is meant to support.

LETTER FROM THE REV. J. P. SMITH, D.D.; WITH REMARKS IN REPLY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

A PARAGRAPH in your work for the present month, virtually calls upon me by name to admit or deny a coincidence, with certain sentiments cited from some speech or writing by Mr. Hinton of Reading, and from the Eclectic Review. I therefore entreat your favouring me by inserting this note.

I. Those sentiments, and the language in which they are conveyed, I lament and disapprove; I may even say, as much as you can do.

II. It appears unjust to hold me, or any of the persons to whom you refer, as answerable for the opinions and expressions of the Eclectic Review, because of an announcement at the close of 1836, (I

know not of any other document,) of which these are the words: "The Editor would have spoken in a much more subdued and diffident tone of the character of his journal, had he not been sustained by the co-operation of numerous gentlemen well-known to the public, the names of several of whom he is authorised to announce as contributors to his pages." Then follows a list of thirty-two names, in which are those which you have mentioned. I cannot perceive any ground whatever for your affirming that those persons "give their names as a guarantee for the opinions and recommendations set forth in that work." If this be a righteous inference, some of us must *more completely* be held as guarantees for the opinions and recommendations occurring in the Christian Observer; on the ground of reading it constantly, approving it (with a few sad exceptions*) cordially, and through not very few years contributing to its pages, under various signatures, and sometimes, when it has appeared necessary, with the person's name. With respect to one person, I can assure you that those contributions have been much more numerous than, in the same space of time, to the Eclectic Review.

III. Notwithstanding my conscientious difference from the Eclectic Review, on some points, chiefly political, I regard it (but *with the exception* of my own few contributions,) as a very valuable and useful work, distinguished by sound views and admirable talent, both as to thought and expression, in theology and religion, in morals and in literary judgment.

IV. With deep conviction I own my belief that the union of Church and State (so *called*, but I view it as a palpable subjugation of the Church to the world,) is contrary to the principles and spirit of Christianity, and, notwithstanding the MUCH GOOD which divine grace has brought out of it, exceedingly obstructive, both to the influence of vital religion and to its diffusion among men.

V. As no references are given, I cannot trace out the passages cited; but it seems to me incredible that such expressions should be found in the Eclectic Review, without something in the connection, which very materially alters the whole meaning and tendency of each passage.

Oh that we may be enabled to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace!"

Homerton, July 2, 1838. J. PYE SMITH.

*** We are too grateful to Dr. Smith for his disclaimer, so far as it goes, to complain that it does not go farther; we only wish that all the other gentlemen

* Permit me to give an instance. About two years ago, you said, "The Dissenters have got an atheistical Marriage-bill." If you will attend the solemnizing of marriage, in dissenting places of worship, I venture to assure you that you will find an equal degree of propriety, seriousness, and a holy tendency, in the manner of conducting that service, to that which characterizes the same celebration in the Church by Law Established; indeed I must confess, to my own feeling, a *much higher* degree of those qualities. I cannot believe that you wish to uphold the pretension established by a capitulary of Charlemagne, about the year 780, that marriage is not legitimate, unless it be blessed in a *sacerdotal* manner, with prayers and oblations by the *priest* (not presbyter, but *sacerdos*, according to the bold impiety of the anti-christian system;) or the decree of Innocent III. (that audacious assertor of the rights of the papal see as *absolute* in all things spiritual and temporal, a monster of tyranny and cruelty, and with Dominic, the founder of the inquisition,) that marriage should be celebrated *only* in churches.

whom the Editor of the Eclectic "is authorised to announce as contributors to his pages," Dr. Vaughan and Mr. Binney among the number, would unite in the disclaimer. As to Dr. Smith's thinking it incredible that such disgraceful language was used by the Eclectic Review, without something materially to alter its meaning and tendency, we beg leave to say, that so far from being incredible, it is in perfect consistency with the spirit in which the Eclectic, the Patriot, and various other dissenting publications, conduct their attacks upon the Church of England. It might appear incredible to Dr. Smith, seeing the candid and obliging terms in which he is pleased to write of the Christian Observer, notwithstanding our differences of opinion with him, that his good friends the Patriot and Eclectic should, not only without truth, but without the slightest shadow or semblance of it, and in direct and unmistakeable opposition to it, say as follows; the former, that "The Magazines and prints supported by the Evangelical Clergy, are, in the unhallowed warfare of personality and *calumny, emulating the vilest of the Sunday papers.* Mr. Gathercole is no longer to be viewed as an exception to the general character of his cloth.....The Christian Observer has become *his apologist and confederate in low and impudent personality*"; and the latter, that "The Christian Observer has become the ally and apologist of his reverend brother Gathercole, supporting him in defiance of truth, and in violation of decency." This being of late the style adopted by dissenting publications, in speaking of the conduct and writings of their brethren of the Established Church, it was very far from being antecedently incredible that the Eclectic Review, in urging all "conscientious dissenters" to form a conspiracy to break the laws of God and man, by refusing to pay parochial assessments, should support its recommendation with such pungent reasons as those which we quoted—namely, that the payers of church-rates "would not hesitate to pay a tax for supporting the false prophet in a Turkish mosque, or withhold their contributions, when legally demanded, for the temple of Juggernaut;" that they support a system, "as deteriorating to the character of Christianity, and as subversive of its influence, *as any form of paganism under the sun*;" "as unlike Christianity" as "the heathenism of Pekin," and whose clergy "are little better than idolaters;" and that these are "*the views of Dissenters generally*," or at least of "very many of all denominations." The antecedent probabilities were in favour of such language being used; for it is not grosser than has been employed at numerous anti-church meetings, and in various dissenting publications, and the Eclectic expressly states that it conveys "the views of dissenters generally;" or at least of "very many of all denominations." But whether antecedently credible or not, it was faithfully copied; and it is an overplus of candour towards his friends for Dr. Smith to intimate that the context may possibly "alter the whole meaning and tendency" of such passages;—whereas, we are sorry to say, it aggravates them. It was from a then recent number of the Eclectic, (not at this moment in our hands) that we made the extracts inserted in our remarks upon Dr. Smith's letter in our January Number; but if Dr. Smith has the slightest difficulty in turning to the passage, we will readily look it out for him. The charge in our last Number, it will be remembered, was only a re-quotation from our January Number; and as Dr. Smith did not reply at the time, we laid aside the memorandum; but it is easy to refer to the Eclectic discussion on church-rates, which we should have thought was too pungent to be forgotten.

We must add a word upon another part of Dr. Smith's letter, which speaks of dissenters contributing to our pages. Now we are very far indeed from esteeming it any disparagement to us, if upon general questions which do not relate to the distinctive characteristics of Churchmen, any persons of piety and good inform-

ation, of whatever name, should be pleased to approve of our labours; nor further, would it involve any sacrifice of principle, if we were every month to insert a paper of religious or miscellaneous literature, or practical piety, furnished by a dissenter. But as our work bears upon its front the declaration that it is "conducted by members of the Established Church;" and as an unfair use might be made of Dr. Smith's affirmation if we did not contradict it, we feel it necessary to state, in the most distinct and unequivocal manner, that we have not, and never had, any dissenting "contributors;" that not any review, or other editorial paper, or of any paper recognized by us as from what is called a contributor, was ever written by a dissenter; nor are we aware that any dissenter ever furnished us even anonymously with an essay, or with any communication whatever which spoke our sentiments. Dr. Smith has made a mistake so extraordinary that we are totally at a loss to account for it, especially in the case of a gentleman so well acquainted with periodical literature as himself. The Eclectic Review, he well knows, is simply and solely a review; all the articles in it take the usual plural form of *we;* it admits no correspondents; when Dr. Smith or any other writer communicates an "article," as it is called, it takes the usual editorial form, and the work is pledged to it; as the Quarterly Review is to its articles, or as the Christian Observer is to its reviews, or remarks on Public Affairs, or Answers to Correspondents. But in the case of magazines, persons who are *not* contributors or recognized correspondents, persons whose views may differ altogether from those of the conductors, can, if they please, send, with or without their name, a statement, or reply, or argument, or explanation, or reprehension, as Dr. Smith is now doing to us, and it may often be very fit, profitable, or candid to insert it; but no person supposes that this is what the Editor of the Eclectic Review means when he gives a list of persons whom "he is authorized to announce as contributors to his pages." We could not announce that either Dr. Smith and Mr. J. Clayton, or Mr. Newman and Mr. Dodgson, are contributors to the Christian Observer; and though Dr. Smith says that his "contributions" to us have been much more numerous than to the Eclectic Review "in the same space of time," they certainly have not been the papers of a writer for our work, but papers to correct something that he considered had been mistaken in it. To say, therefore, that he is as much a guarantee for the opinions and recommendations of a publication to which he sends a letter as an opponent, as to one in which he is advertised by name as a writer of leading articles, is a most extraordinary statement. We have no right or wish to make him responsible for anything which he may disapprove in the Eclectic Review; but no person can doubt that when the conductor of that work advertised that he was authorised to name him as among his "contributors," he meant this to bespeak confidence, and to do honour to his pages.

We are sure that neither Dr. Smith, nor any other candid dissenter, will construe these remarks as intended to disparage the piety, learning, or literary ability of any writer because he is not of our own communion; but we could not allow the above misstatement (unintentional we are sure, but most gross,) to go out without the fullest contradiction. Every one of the "contributors" to our publication is, and always has been, a churchman; to have requested dissenters to become writers for a Church of England work, would have been as uncourteous as it would have been superfluous and in every way undesirable; and strange would it be if while so often stating our opinion that schools, Missionary institutions, and Tract societies, cannot be rightly conducted, subject to incongruous amalgamations, we should have imagined that the experiment was advisable in the case of a magazine, which, to be sustained conscientiously, con-

sistently, and effectively, must be conducted by men of one heart and mind; and in our case by "members of the Established Church."

Dr. Smith's note on the Marriage Bill, as well as his fourth head upon "the Union of Church and State," (not our phrase, and one which we think very exceptionable) are beside the object of his communication, which ought to have embraced only a reply to what we said of himself in connexion with the Eclectic Review. We will not, however, mutilate his letter; though it would be irrelevant to open the discussion of these questions in connexion with the present subject, and impossible to do justice to them in a few passing remarks. We must content ourselves with replying to assertion by assertion; for "with deep conviction we own our belief" that to provide for the national worship of God, and the religious instruction of the people, is a solemn and bounden duty of Christian legislatures; and that, without troubling ourselves about Charlemagne or Pope Innocent, churches are the most fitting places for publicly solemnizing holy matrimony, which is a type of "the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church." We certainly do not say that the solemnity would not be valid elsewhere; for as we are reminded in our service, this "holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with his presence, and first miracle that he wrought in Cana of Galilee," at a social feast and not in a synagogue; and special archiepiscopal licences, we lament to say, are allowed in our own country for marriages in drawing-rooms. But confining ourselves to simple explanation, we beg leave to correct the unjust impression conveyed in Dr. Smith's note, that we ever intimated that because the dissenters procured "an atheistical marriage-bill," they would marry atheistically. Now, if our readers will refer to the copious abstract of the new Marriage Act in our volume for 1836, "about two years ago," pp. 637—640, (which is the passage we suppose alluded to by Dr. Smith,) they will read as follows:—

"Matters being prepared, one of the Registrars of the district is to attend with the parties and two or more witnesses, at a time agreed upon, at the registered building, or, in case the parties are so atheistically scrupulous as to object to the registered building as being a place of religious worship, then at the Registrar's office; and they are to declare that they know not of any lawful impediment to their union; and each is to say, 'I call upon these persons here present to witness that I, *A. B.*, do take thee, *C. D.*, to be my lawful wedded wife (or husband;' and they are to pay to the Registrar, if married by certificate, five shillings, and if by licence, ten; and the Registrar is then to enter the marriage in his book, from which the Superintending Registrar is to transcribe it into his; and the record then falls under the provisions of the General Registry.

"In this godless, graceless manner, parties are to be united together in legal matrimony. There is not a word of any religious ceremonial; though, if married at a registered building, the parties may add that if they please, *and no doubt will in most cases do so.* As the principle of congregational Independency is adopted by almost all the Dissenters, and 'free prayer' is one of the most essential parts of their system, they cannot be tied to any particular form, or unite together, without a violation of their principles, to arrange a common plan; so that no person can tell how he will be married under the new system, any more than what the minister will pray for, or exhort. Will the new Congregational 'Convocation' seize the occasion to fetter its free brethren by 'recommending' an appropriate formula?

"Some persons have urged conscientious scruples against the use of the Church of England service; and it was right that their scruples should be respected. We distinctly and unequivocally repudiate forcing any man to attend any religious ceremonial against his conscience. But then, as the persons thus scrupling could not agree among themselves as to any religious form, and some objected to all religious forms whatever, the Legislature could only say that those who approve the established form may still use it; and for those who do not, one general provision shall be made as respects the civil portion of the contract, the church fees being transferred to the new officer, and each sect superadding what it pleases, or nothing, if that be preferred. What is chiefly to be

lamented, is the necessarily atheistical tendency of this working of 'the voluntary principle;' for when once the dissenting minority in a nation becomes so considerable or powerful, that the system of a national church is legislatively interfered with, there is no resource but in practical atheism. Had the Legislature proposed to add only so slight a benediction to the nuptial ceremony, as 'God bless your union,' this would have been rejected on the ground that it was a religious form, and that it would be offensive to those who do not believe in the existence or the providence of a Supreme Being. There could, we repeat, be no medium, nationally speaking, between practical atheism and an established church. *Many individuals may indeed supply in their own case the defect; and we have no doubt but that the great majority of Dissenters and their Ministers will use religious and edifying services;* but the Legislature could not upon the voluntary principle recognize them. And here it is that we see so frightful a gulf before us. It is not this particular Act, but the principle involved in it, that alarms us. The Legislature has pronounced, that according to the voluntary principle, marriage shall be accounted a civil atheistical compact. Nationally, we have thrown off all recognition of God in this solemn transaction; dissent has forced the Legislature to do so; and to be consistent, the voluntary principle must do much more.

"The issue ought to be placed thus in its full results, in order that those who are ignorantly enamoured of the supposed liberality and excellence of the voluntary system, and yet are not prepared to blot out Sabbaths and all other Christian institutions from the land, may see the depth of the precipice before them."

Was it possible to express more fully our belief, that though the statute is atheistical,—which it is, for it does not in the slightest manner recognize any reference to a Deity,—pious dissenters would of course add sacred rites to the solemnization? If such candid and considerate men as Dr. Smith thus hastily mistake the words of their brethren of the Establishment, what must we expect from unscrupulous controversialists?

We are not sorry, however, that Dr. Smith has reminded us of our remarks penned "about two years ago," because it gives us an opportunity of stating as historical fact what was then probable anticipation. From a return made to the House of Commons, at the instance of Sir R. H. Inglis, it appears that 1136 places of worship have been licensed for marriages; that from June 30 to the end of December in 1837, marriages to the number of 1292 have been solemnized in registered places of worship, and that 453 have been—we cannot say *solemnized*, but contracted—in the registrar's counting house, with just as little of religion, or even of decent form, as if the parties had gone to a rail-road office to pay for tickets for a Sunday jaunt. Now it is very satisfactory to us to find that the marriages in registered places, during six months, average scarcely more than one to each place. The whole number of Dissenting marriages in London during six months, including Roman Catholics, Quakers, Jews, Independents, Baptists, and all other classes of Separatists, was only 285; whereas those in church, according to the Church form, amounted to 6032; considerably more than twenty to one, all sects included. Of the 285 marriages, those of Evangelical Protestant Dissenters constitute only a portion—perhaps a small portion; and we are far from doubting that they have been conducted, as Dr. Smith says, with "propriety, seriousness, and a holy tendency." The average of Socinian marriages is, we presume, greater than that of Evangelical Dissenters; but neither do we call these atheistical marriages. But of the 453 register-office marriages, which is more than one third of the aggregate of Roman Catholic, Quaker, Jew, and Protestant Dissenting marriages, will Dr. Smith venture to assert that they are not atheistical? They are not consecrated by prayer or holy benediction; the parties only say, "I do take thee to be my lawful wedded wife" (or husband), and pay the Registrar his fees, and then they are, lawfully indeed—that is, by law—man and wife; but with no more recognition of a God or a Providence (we say nothing of Christianity) than if they were Pagans—we beg the Pagans' pardon,

for Pagans do not deny the being of a God, though they have changed his incorruptible glory; but these registrar-office marriages—if not altogether thoughtless, as probably they often are—are ostentatiously atheistical;—atheistical, not merely by defect but in principle, for they declare before the world that there is no religious rite or solemnity whatever in which the parties can join; they cannot in conscience repair to any theistical chapel, be it Jewish, Socinian, or infidel; they must go where they will not be insulted even with the credulity of Deism. It is to this atheistical result that the doctrine of voluntaryism is propelling our public institutions. The Christian Sabbath must be nationally abolished;—we ask Dr. Smith for one shred of argument by which, on his principles, it can be legislatively upheld;—our next monarch must be crowned as atheistically as his subjects are married; and no difference will be left between us and heathen nations, except that they did not know what we deliberately rejected. We had rather not have had occasion to repeat these painful truths; the re-introduction of the subject has not been of our seeking; but as Dr. Smith has brought it forward in our pages, we should not act conscientiously if we did not once more declare our solemn conviction. We do not mean that the advocates of the doctrine of voluntaryism wish to precipitate the nation into the gulf of atheism or infidelity; not at all: Dr. Smith would consecrate the Lord's day, and pray, and preach, and instruct the ignorant, and warn sinners, and be zealous in every work of piety and charity, and have a congregation of devout worshippers, if national religion were abolished in England, as it was in France at the (first) Revolution; and we doubt not that for many years to come religious institutions would still be kept up and flourish; but this is not the question; the real point is, Ought nations in their united and legislative capacity to acknowledge God, and to promote his worship and service? How there can be any difference of opinion on such a subject among Christians (there is none among Jews, Turks, or heathens) is to us an unsolvable mystery.

DR. M'HALE, NOT LUTHER, SCHISMATICAL.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

MAY I request you to allow me to notice on assertion of the (Most) Rev. Dr. M'Hale (the titular Archbishop of Tuam), in his late Letters to Lord John Russell, which shews how sore is still the Roman Church on the part which Luther took in the Reformation. Dr. M'Hale says, in defence of his sentiments respecting the Irish National Schools as being the sentiments of his Church, "The *solus eram* is not a sentiment congenial to the faith or discipline of the Catholic Church; it is the motto which is seen inscribed on the forehead of every schismatic from Simon Magus to Luther." Those who know the opinions of Luther from his own words, will feel well assured that St. Peter would not have addressed the same rebuke to Luther which he addressed to Simon Magus. If Simon Magus was a schismatic, certainly Luther never thought or acted like him.

It cannot be denied, even by Romanists, that their Church needed some reformation before the Council of Trent; for that Council was holden, among other objects, expressly *ad reformationem cleri et populi Christiani*. This is declared in the first session: and from the instructions given by the Council to the parochial clergy in the *Cate-*

chismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos, set forth *by command* of *Pope Pius* 5th, we may form some judgment whether Dr. M'Hale is not more schismatical, and has deviated more from those instructions given by the Pope's authority, than Luther: and whether Luther, in his labours for the reformation of the Christian clergy and people, did not act up to the letter of those instructions more sincerely and effectually than Dr. M'Hale did at Achill, or is now doing.

The Catechism, at page 4, after quoting from Ephes. iv., that Christ gave apostles, prophets, pastors, and teachers, who should make known the word of life; and from 1 Thess. ii., that the word ministered should be received, not as the word of men, but, as it is truly, the word of God; goes on from St. Matt. xxviii., to say, "But indeed, since this preaching of the Divine word ought never to be left off in the Church, then certainly at this time ministers should labour with greater earnestness and piety, that the faithful should be nourished and strengthened with sound and uncorrupt doctrine as the bread of life."

Again, at p. 7 of the Catechism, in reference to the end at which pastors should aim, it is said, "that therefore seems to be the first thing, that they always should remember that all the knowledge of a Christian man is contained in this head, or rather, as our Saviour says, This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Wherefore the labour of a teacher in the Church will be employed chiefly in this, that the faithful may from their heart desire to know Jesus Christ, and him crucified; and may persuade themselves for certain, and may believe with the inmost piety and religion of heart, that no other name is given to men under heaven in which they must be saved, because he is the propitiation for our sins." If Luther and Dr. M'Hale are tried by these words of the Trent Catechism, as to their conformity to these instructions, in doctrine and practice, or their departure from them, there can be little doubt whether of the two an upright jury would pronounce to be a schismatic.

But I will endeavour to shew, from Luther's own words, that the great desire of his heart was to effect this very work, that *the faithful should be nourished* and *strengthened* with *sound doctrine*,—even *the bread of life*, in the *knowledge of Christ crucified, who is the propitiation for our sins*. I wish there was any good evidence to prove that Dr. M'Hale is labouring, in the meekness and gentleness of Christ, to effect the same good work as a minister of Christ. But the name of Achill reminds me that some good precepts, published in the *Catechismus ad Parochos* were more truly fulfilled by Luther than by any who are sent forth from Maynooth, having been there supported by British bounty.

Now on Psalm xlv. (vol. iii. of his folio works) Luther, in reference to the words "Forget *also* thine own people and *thy father's house*," thus writes,—"I will not forget the house of my father, if only he will suffer me to believe in Christ alone, that I may thus preserve my conscience pure and free from every burden. But the Pope does not allow this, but insists that I should follow his doctrine in neglect of the word of Christ. I say then, since I cannot retain both my father's house and Christ, let Christ my king remain to me; and let my father's house, with all that belongs to it, go whither it will." It is evident from this and other like sentences of Luther,

that he was forced to leave the Roman Church because he could not profess and hold the doctrine of Christ crucified as the sole propitiation for our sins while following other doctrines of the Pope.

On the same Psalm, because Luther had been charged with disobedience to the Pope's authority, he says, "We answer to this charge that we do not accuse the Pope of personal errors, but of his doctrine, and respecting the hearing of the word; because the Pope impugns the glory and grace of God, and Christ himself, of whom the Father said, 'Hear ye him.' For the Pope wishes to take away this hearing from Christ, and to assume it to himself, and to turn us, the disciples of Christ, from Christ to himself. On this point we contend. The question is of higher matters, respecting the Son of God, who died for us and rose again—respecting Christ preached, and to be preached, and to be heard. When the Pope wishes to hinder this by alleging the authority of the Church, we say to him, Away, be gone. We forgive your personal faults, but we forgive not your blasphemies and denials of Christ, nor do we unite in them; because Christ is greater than the Church, which you allege against us: nay; because your Church persecutes the word of Christ."

In vol. ii. Exeget. Opera, p. 242, Luther says, "We must look to the word only, and judge from it. Whoever embrace that truly, they are those who, like mount Zion, shall not be moved. The Church is the daughter, born of the word, and is not the mother of the word. Let us not regard how great and powerful the Pope is, who boasts himself to be the Church, and preaches his apostolic succession and his personal dignity. Let us look to the word: if he embraces that, let us judge him to be the church." In p. 244 Luther says, "We are loaded with great odium, because we are said to have departed from the ancient church: on the other hand, the Papists glory that they have continued with the church, and are willing to refer all things to the judgment of the church. But here we are accused falsely. For if we may declare the truth, we departed from the word when we were yet in their Church; but now we have returned to the word, and have ceased to be apostates from the word. Therefore though by their judgment they deprive us of the title of a church, yet we retain the word, and through the word we retain all the ornaments of the true church."

May I be allowed to add an extract from Luther's Comment on Isaiah i.?—"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord." Here Luther says, "For, having cast away their trust in the mercy of God, they believed that they should be justified by their sacrifices, as by the *opus operatum;* that which at this day we also blame in our Papists. For this is to take away the glory from Christ, and to attribute it to our own work. In all our discourses and writings we strive for this against our adversaries,—that we indeed teach that God is not appeased by any of our works or merits, but freely pardons those who trust in his mercy." Again: "Wherever this Gospel is sincerely preached, there is the kingdom of Christ; and this mark of the church and of the kingdom of Christ cannot deceive you; for wherever there is the word, there is the Holy Spirit. Therefore the Papacy errs, which thinks that there are other marks of the church than the word. For this word has always been the perpetual and infallible mark of the church. They only belong to this kingdom

of Christ, who are in the perpetual use of the word. That only is the church which has the pure word and pure sacraments."

I will only add that on the words, "Our chastisement was laid upon him," Luther says, "The Papists have made other Saviours and intercessors—Mary, and the rest of the saints;"—On "By his stripes we are healed,"—"If any man therefore wishes to be healed, let him look unto Christ and believe: then he will be healed; that is, he will have everlasting righteousness."

The author of Spiritual Despotism, p. 345, declares that "The Reformation was God's interposition in behalf of the church and truth; as a rescue of the Scriptures, as a recovery of the great principles of the Gospel." This declaration is supported by all historical evidence. And by these fruits of the Divine interposition ought not all ministers of the Christian church to be judged, as to their promoting the true interests of Christ's church? Does Dr. M'Hale promote the rescue of the Scriptures, the recovery of the great principles of the Gospel? Do the authors of the Oxford Tracts promote these primary objects of the Reformation? Who then is a schismatic? Certainly not Luther, who gave up every thing that he might follow the Divine leadings,—in the rescue of the Scriptures, and in the recovery of the great principles of the Gospel. Believing the Christian Observer to be conducted on principles accordant with Luther's, I remain, &c.

I. H.

ON AFFECTED REVERENCE FOR CHRISTIANITY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In reading the speeches of some of our public men, and the remarks in many modern books and newspapers, I am often reminded of a shrewd observation of Goldsmith respecting his brother historian, Hume. He says, "With regard to religion, Mr. Hume seems desirous of playing a double part,—of appearing to some readers as if he reverenced, and to others as if he ridiculed, it. He seems sensible of the political necessity of religion in every state; but at the same time he would every where insinuate that it owes its authority to no higher an origin. Thus he weakens its influence, while he contends for its utility; and vainly hopes, that while free-thinkers shall applaud his scepticism, real believers will reverence him for his zeal."

This base hypocritical style of writing is far more dangerous than the most bitter sneers or virulent invectives of infidelity; yet I lament to say that it is too prevalent at the present moment; except indeed that some who adopt it evidently do not think religion necessary even politically, but pretend a degree of almost sarcastic veneration for it, because they find this a convenient sacrifice to public opinion. I have read House of Lords and Commons speeches upon questions connected with religion, which affected to respect Christianity, and only to guard against excess; while it was plain to any man who looked beneath the surface, that the speaker accounted the whole matter superstition and imposture, and would have said so if he durst. He said in effect, "I am gulling the gullible; but I hope no brother philosopher thinks me in earnest."

Every reader ought in these our days to be on his guard against

the effects of this insidious style, which is awfully calculated to do injury to the cause of religion. In my own case I have come to one general conclusion; that when a writer or speaker begins with his great respect for the Gospel, and then proceeds to disparage it, or to advocate some flagrant breach of God's commandments, his panegyric is only a concession to public opinion, and that he is at least an infidel. Tried by this practical test, it is to be feared that scepticism is of no rare occurrence. We have great cause to bless God that the national acknowledgment of Christianity, and still more the outpoured grace of his Holy Spirit in the revival of true religion, have made infidels ashamed of avowing their infidelity; but let us not therefore be drawn into the unscriptural conclusion that the carnal mind has ceased to be emnity against God.

PHILALETHES.

ON "BAPTIZING" OR "CHRISTENING" SHIPS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

EVERY religious mind must be shocked at that mixture of profaneness and popery which we constantly hear of in what is called "baptizing" or "christening" ships. The Papists are accustomed to baptize bells and other things, and, it may be, ships among the number; and with them the practice, though superstitious and unscriptural, professes at least to be reverent and religious, just like the annual benediction of the cattle by the Pope. The priest may juggle for filthy lucre, and the people be deceived by vain words; yet no person avows that the whole is intended to be a mockery.

But what shall we say of the custom to which I have alluded, in a Protestant country? The ship is named while a bottle of wine is broken on her bows, in parody of the holy sacrament of baptism. The ceremony is called "christening;" and we read in the newspapers such profane language as "the jolly baptism of wine," and "the sponsorial bottle." I was particularly shocked with this last expression, in lately reading the account of the launching of the Earl of Hardwick East Indiaman. I would not, however, have pained the minds of your readers by quoting such ungodly language, but for the sake of proposing a remedy. The launching of a ship is not an obscure transaction; it is known of beforehand; and in most cases we may hope that some of the owners, or officers, or crew, or workmen, or persons who intend to be present at the ceremony, would be led to see the profaneness of the custom, if it were properly represented to them, and to forego it. Attention might also be drawn to the subject in the newspapers, when a conspicuous launch is about to take place; and, in particular, the individual who is expected to give the name, or to break the bottle of wine, might be seriously remonstrated with; for surely nothing but want of consideration could cause such awful profaneness to be persisted in. Firing guns, sounding trumpets, and many other innocent ceremonials, might be devised, if necessary, to give eclat to the naming of the ship, without burlesquing a Divine ordinance. But still better would it be if the parties concerned could be induced to consecrate the occasion to a religious use; as perhaps was the case many centuries ago, though under the influence

of debasing superstition. The launching of a vessel which is to carry out human beings upon the face of the mighty deep, amidst all the perils of the treacherous elements, and with only a plank between life and death, time and eternity, might well be consecrated by faith and prayer almost with the solemnity of a Church.

A LANDSMAN.

ON THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,—I was glad to observe a correspondent in your Number for May, expressing a wish that some of your valuable pages might be dedicated to a "temperate, scriptural, and brotherly discussion" of questions connected with that important and extensive portion of Holy Writ, unfulfilled prophecy. Every one is aware how many difficulties there are in the way of such a discussion. The pride and presumption of man have opposed more hindrances to the study of this, than perhaps of any other, part of God's word. Nevertheless the power of that word remains the same, and is now as ever profitable; and as your correspondent justly remarks, there is such a special blessing promised to those who engage in the study of unfulfilled prophecy, that we have a warrant to expect that those who devote themselves humbly and prayerfully to the work shall be made honoured instruments of good to the Church, while they shall not remain without benefit to their own souls.

Your correspondent Paulinus has brought forward seven arguments against the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine; an event which I, in common with many other Christians, believe to be clearly foretold in all the prophets who speak of the future destinies and glories of Israel. It is not my wish to take upon myself the office of replying to his objections. I earnestly hope, and feel almost sure, that some one more capable than myself will take the matter in hand; and with that hope I refrain at present from enlarging on the subject; but should my expectations be disappointed, I shall feel it my duty to do what I can towards furnishing Paulinus and his friends with a "clear and satisfactory reply" to each one of his objections, by endeavouring to show him that the promise made to Abraham and his seed, of possessing the land in which they were strangers, has never yet been fulfilled; that its completion took place neither under Joshua nor Ezra; and that it continues in full force under the Gospel. In the meanwhile, I take the liberty of sending a collection of texts, which some of your readers may possibly not have seen, connected with the subject. It is, I believe, appended to Brown's Self-interpreting Bible, but is not unworthy of being transcribed into your periodical.

Texts relating to the Restoration of the Jews.

I. The Jews shall be gathered from all parts of the earth, where they are now scattered, and brought home to their own land. For this, see Isai. xi. 11; xxvii. 12, 13; xliii. 5, 6; xlix. 11, 12. Compare Jeremiah iii. 18; xvi. 14, 15; xxiii. 3; xxx. 10; xxxi. 7, 8, 10, xxxii. 37. So Hosea xi. 10, 11; Zeph. iii. 10; Zech. viii. 7, 8; x. 8—10.

II. They shall be carried by the Gentiles unto their place, who shall join themselves with the Jews, and become the Lord's people. Isai. xlix. 22; lx. 9; lxvi. 19, 20. Compare Jerem. iii. 17; xvi. 19; Ezek. xlviii. 22, 23; Micah v. 3; Zech. ii. 11; viii. 20—23.

III. Great miracles shall be wrought when Israel is restored; as formerly, when they were brought out of Egypt; viz.

1. Drying up the river Euphrates. Isai. xi. 15, 16: Zech x. 11; Rev. xvi. 12; Hos. ii. 15; Mic. vii. 15.

2. Causing rivers to flow in desert places. Isai. xli. 17—19; xlviii. 20, 21; xliii. 19, 20.

3. Giving them prophets. Isai. lxvi. 18—21; Hos. xii. 9, 10.

4. The Lord Christ shall appear at the head of them. Isai. xxxv. 8; lii. 12; lviii. 8; Hos. i. 10, 11; Mic. ii. 13.

IV. The Jews being restored, and converted to the faith of Christ, shall be formed into a State, and have judges and counsellors over them as formerly; the Lord Christ himself being their King, who shall then be acknowledged king over all the earth. Isai. i. 26; lx. 17. Compare Jerem. xxiii. 4; xxx. 8, 9, 21; Hosea, iii. 5; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24; xxxvii. 24, 25; Isa. liv. 5; Obad. 21; Zech. xiv. 5, 9; Psl. xxii. 27, 28.

V. They shall have the victory over all their enemies, and all kings and nations of the earth shall submit unto them. Isa. xi. 13, 14; xli. 14—16; xlix. 23; lx. 12; xxv. 10—12; Joel iii. 7, 8, 19, 20; Obad. 17, 18; Mic. iv. 6—8, 11—13; v. 5—7; vii. 16, 17; Zech ii. 13; ix. 13—15; x. 5, 6; xii. 6; Numb. xxiv. 17; Isai. xlix. 23; lx. 10—16; lxvi. 19, 20.

VI. The Jews, restored, shall live peaceably, without being divided into two nations, or contending any more with each other. Isai. xi. 13, 14; xiv. 1, 2; Jer. iii. 18; l. 4; Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22; Hos. i. 11.

1. They shall be very numerous, and multiply greatly. Isai. xxvii. 6; xliv. 3, 4; xlix. 18—21; liv. 1—3; lxi. 9; Jer. xxiii. 3; xxx. 18—20; xxxi. 27; Ezek. xxxiv. 11; xxxvi. 38.

2. They shall have great peace, safety, and outward prosperity. Isai. xxxii. 16—18; xxxiii. 24; liv. 13—17; lx. 18—21; Jer. xxiii. 3—6; xxx. 10; xxxii. 34, 41; xxxiii. 6—9; l. 19, 20; Joel. iii. 17, 18; Micah vii. 18—20; Zeph. iii. 13; Zech. iii. 9, 10.

3. They shall be very glorious, and a blessing to the whole earth. Isai. xix. 24, 25; lxi. 9; Jer. xxxiii. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 26; Zeph. iii. 19, 20; Zech. viii. 13.

VII. The land of Judea shall be made eminently fruitful. Isa. xxix. 17; xxxv. 1, 2, 7, 9; li. 3, 16; liv. 11—13; lv. 12, 13; lx. 17; lxv. 17, 25; Ezek. xxxiv. 26, 27; xxxvi. 37; Joel. iii. 18; Amos ix. 13, 14.

VIII. Jerusalem shall be rebuilt, and after the full restoration of the Jews, shall never be destroyed, nor infested with enemies any more. Isai. lii. 1; xxvi. 1; lx. 18; xxxiii. 6; Joel iii. 17; Obad. 17; Zech. xiv. 10, 11; Jer. xxxi. 38—40; Ezek. xxxviii. 11.

IX. A little before the time of the Jews' call and conversion, there shall be wars, confusion, and desolation in the earth. Isa. xxxiv. throughout; Joel iii. 1, 10; Zeph. iii. 8, 9; Ezek. xxviii. 25, 26; Hag. ii. 21—23; Jer. xxx. 7—10; 2 Chron. xv. 3—7.

I will add only one remark. The passages above cited are generally considered as figurative predictions of the prosperity of the

Church of Christ in the latter days. I, on the contrary, believe them to refer primarily and principally to the Jewish people. It was a statute of the law of Moses, as contained in Deut. xxiii. 24, 25, "when thou comest into thy neighbour's vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own pleasure; but thou shalt not put any in thy vessel." And again: "When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand, but thou shalt not move a sickle into thy neighbour's standing corn." In like manner, it strikes me, when we read promises and predictions of glory to Israel, we are at liberty to extract therefrom all the comfort and benefit which such promises are undoubtedly calculated to afford God's children in every age, but in no wise must we wrest them from those whose peculiar property they are. But I forbear to say more, in the earnest hope, as I have stated, that some abler pen will be employed on the subject; if not, I will, with God's blessing, resume it hereafter, for I feel sure there is a great error which Christians are not duly aware of, in interpreting figuratively what God has so evidently intended to bear a plain and literal signification.

W. P. S.

ON SECTARIAN OMISSIONS IN TRACTS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Rajportana, 14th January, 1838.

FROM the note at page 24 of your Number for January 1837, you appear to be fully alive to the unreasonable principle of the Anabaptists both in this country (India) and elsewhere, with reference to their Sectarian translation of the Holy Scriptures. Their proceedings in some other matters are perhaps not more catholic or consistent; it is satisfactory, however, to know that these latter doings also have not eluded your impartial observation.

The design of the Tract Society, in its garbled Commentary from Henry and Scott, will, it is to be hoped, defeat itself, and, ere long, result in good. But in the mean time does it not challenge the friends of the Establishment—or rather, does it not directly summon them—to meet these suppressions by another publication for completing the matters so pointedly abandoned to them? And in this case may not the opinions thus secretly expunged by the Society be brought to receive more undivided attention from the public, whilst of course the doctrines too will regain their own due prominence? Thus will be provided a timely remedy against the omissions of the Tract Society, and the Church be furnished with a much required—and, at this crisis, a very desirable—treatise upon the doctrines in question. Could you not suggest to the Christian Knowledge Society to publish such a work corresponding in size, &c., with the Tract Society's edition; and to give, in addition to the opinions of Henry and Scott, the concurrent sentiments of those worthy old catholic divines, the British Reformers, so that the public may have the whole truth upon the excluded doctrines?

MILES.

*** The two objections specified by us, and now re-echoed from India, to the Religious Tract Society's publications, were, first, that the Society has amalgamated itself with a sect, by blotting out the Scriptural and catholic truth

held equally by Romanists and by the great mass of Protestants, of the duty of dedicating children to God in baptism; and secondly, that in order to conciliate another sect—that of the Voluntaries (as they have come to be called)—it has renounced another most important truth, never doubted of by the universal church of Christ, that it is the duty of Christian nations to institute and maintain the public worship of God. There was the superadded objection in the case of the Society's Commentary, that the two divines from whose exposition it professed to be chiefly taken, did most strongly inculcate both these truths; so that the secret suppression of them was unjust to the authors, to the subject, to the reader, and to truth. There are other objections to the Society's tracts; which we passed over in consideration of the vast aggregate of sound, solid, edifying, and scriptural matter to be found in them; indeed, we were unwilling to complain at all; but we could not refrain in regard to the systematic suppression of the two important doctrines above mentioned, which enter into the actual duties of individuals, of families, and of nations; and to the impression thereby conveyed, that they are of so little moment that divines could write innumerable treatises of theoretical and practical theology, and commentaries *on the whole of Scripture*, without so much as alluding to them. We do not, however, think that a mere collection of rejected passages would be readable; especially as the omissions, though numerous, are rather brief and significative than large in bulk. We do not build our faith upon Scott, or Henry, or even upon our venerable Reformers; but what we said was, that it is not right secretly to garble their works in order to keep out of view truths which they set forth as highly important. The suppression of Matthew Henry's sentiments respecting National Church Establishments was peculiarly unfair and deceptive; because, being a Non-conformist, and a man justly held in the highest estimation by Evangelical Dissenters, his opinion was of importance to be referred to in our arguments with the advocates for the voluntary principle. We agree with MILES that useful selections might be made from the writings of our Reformers; not so much, however, on Infant Baptism or National Church Establishments—which there was not much special occasion for them to urge, as upon other questions which called forth their full strength of discussion.

POETRY.

HARVEST HOME.

(Original, from a Collection of Hymns for public worship, by the Rev. J. H. Gurney.)

LORD, at thy word the constant sun
Doth through the world obedient run;
The varying seasons haste their round,
With plenty all our years are crowned:
Our song shall be,
Great God, of Thee;
Let the wide earth Thy praise resound.

When Spring doth wake the song of mirth,
When Summer warms the fruitful earth,
Should Winter sweep the naked plain,
Or Autumn yield its ripened grain,
Our song shall be,
Great God, of Thee;
Through all their changes Thou dost reign.

But chiefly when Thy bounty pours
Through all our fields its copious stores,
When Nature wears her richest dress,
And Earth doth teem with fruitfulness,
Our song shall be,
Great God, of Thee;
With heart and voice Thy name we bless.

With sounds of mirth the mountains ring,
The corn-clad valleys laugh and sing;
Our gardens stored, our labours blest,
Let not our tongues in silence rest;
Our song shall be,
Great God, of Thee,
The mightiest of our friends, and best.

CHRIST OUR PATTERN.

(From the same.)

LORD, as to Thy dear cross we flee,
And plead to be forgiven;
So let Thy life our pattern be,
And form our souls for heaven.

Help us, through good report and ill,
Our daily cross to bear;
Like Thee to do our Father's will,
Our brethren's griefs to share.

Let grace our selfishness expel,
Our earthliness repine,
And kindness in our bosoms dwell,
As free and true as Thine.

If joy shall at Thy bidding fly,
And grief's dark day come on,
We, in our turn, would meekly cry,
"Father, Thy will be done."

Should friends misjudge, or foes defame,
Or brethren faithless prove,
Then, like Thine own, be all our aim
To conquer them by love.

Kept peaceful in the midst of strife,
Forgiving and forgiven,
O may we lead the pilgrim's life,
And follow Thee to heaven.

BOYHOOD.

"When I was a child I spake as a child, I thought as a child;—but when I became a man, I put away childish things." 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

(From "Remember Israel;" a collection of poems by a Clergyman, 1838.)

WHEN once I was a little boy,
And roved through lanes and sunny fields,
I used to feel a careless joy,
Which, somehow, now I never feel.

'Twas like the thoughtless butterfly
Which flits all day from flower to flower,
Nor ever stays to ponder why
It may not live another hour.

Such is the joy those only know,
Who have no thought of anxious care,
And live upon this world below,
As if their all were centered here.

I ever loved the sunniest skies,
And fed on flower's honey dew,
And never thought that all my joys
Could prove so utterly untrue.

I followed phantoms all the day,
The phantoms of a joyous mind,
And when I found they would not stay,
I left them willingly behind.

Whene'er I saw a rainbow shed
Its jewelled tears o'er hill or vale,
By its unreal brilliance led,
I tried to chase its shadowy sail.

Such was I then—all glad and gay,
O'er this world's flow'ry path I ran:
But then I was a child——To day
Childhood hath melted into man.

THE PAVILION.

"For in the time of trouble he shall hide me in his pavilion." Ps. xxvii. 5.

(From "Sabbatical Verses," by Joseph J. Gurney, Esq.)

Pavilions and palaces rise o'er the land,
And noble and wealthy are they that command
The pleasure and pomp of the world;
Delicious their viands and glowing their wine,
And gorgeous and dazzling the emblems that shine
On the banner by monarchs unfurled.

But vain is their honour, and brief is their day,
And the presage of night overhangs its display,
They riot to wither and die;
No charm can enliven the house of the dead,
Their banquet is past, and the cold worm is fed
Where princes and potentates lie.

The glory that here to the worldling is given,
Like meteors that gleam in the dark vaults of heaven,
Is lost in a moment to sight;
The sheen of the jewels, the glare of the crown,
When the angel of death mows the lofty one down,
Are quenched in the shadows of night.

There is a pavilion the world cannot see,
Of heavenly structure, appointed for thee,
Thou child of affliction and fears;
Dismayed as thou art at the sight of thy sin,
'Tis thine a compassionate Saviour to win,
Who wept, and can pity thy tears.

Though the troubler of Israel come in like a flood,
Thy pardon is sealed with Immanuel's blood,
Immanuel calls thee his own;
He quiets the storm of the penitent breast,
And under his shadow permits thee to rest,
Till he waft thee away to his throne.

How soft is that shadow, how sure its defence,
How transcendant its joys o'er the pleasures of sense,
Like the joys of the angels above!
His table with spiritual dainties is spread,
The wine of the kingdom, the heavenly bread,
And his banner is INFINITE LOVE.

THE THREE SONS.

(From Poems by the Rev. J. Moultrie, 1837.)

"I HAVE a son, a little son, a boy just five years old,
With eyes of thoughtful earnestness, and mind of gentle mould.
They tell me that unusual grace in all his ways appears,
That my child is grave and wise of heart beyond his childish years.
I cannot say how this may be, I know his face is fair,
And yet his chiefest comeliness is his sweet and serious air:
I know his heart is kind and fond, I know he loveth me,
But loveth yet his mother more with grateful fervency:
But that which others most admire, is the thought which fills his mind,
The food for grave enquiring speech he every where doth find.
Strange questions doth he ask of me, when we together walk;
He scarcely thinks as children think, or talks as children talk.
Nor cares he much for childish sports, dotes not on bat or ball,
But looks on manhood's ways and works, and aptly mimicks all.
His little heart is busy still, and oftentimes perplext
With thoughts about this world of ours, and thoughts about the next.
He kneels at his dear mother's knee, she teacheth him to pray,
And strange, and sweet, and solemn then are the words which he will say.
Oh, should my gentle child be spared to manhood's years like me,
A holier and a wiser man I trust that he will be;
And when I look into his eyes, and stroke his thoughtful brow,
I dare not think what I should feel were I to lose him now.

I have a son, a second son, a simple child of three;
I'll not declare how bright and fair his little features be,
How silver sweet those tones of his when he prattles on my knee:
I do not think his light blue eye is, like his brother's, keen,
Nor his brow so full of childish thought as his hath ever been;
But his little heart's a fountain pure of kind and tender feeling,
And his every look's a gleam of light, rich depths of love revealing.
When he walks with me, the country folk, who pass us in the street,
Will shout for joy, and bless my boy, he looks so mild and sweet.
A playfellow is he to all, and yet, with cheerful tone,
Will sing his little song of love, when left to sport alone.
His presence is like sunshine sent to gladden home and hearth,
To comfort us in all our griefs, and sweeten all our mirth.
Should *he* grow up to riper years, God grant his heart may prove
As sweet a home for heavenly grace as now for earthly love:
And if, beside his grave, the tears our aching eyes must dim,
God comfort us for all the love which we shall lose in him.

I have a son, a third sweet son; his age I cannot tell,
For they reckon not by years and months where he is gone to dwell.
To us, for fourteen anxious months, his infant smiles were given,
And then he bade farewell to Earth, and went to live in Heaven.
I cannot tell what form his is, what looks he weareth now,
Nor guess how bright a glory crowns his shining seraph brow.
The thoughts that fill his sinless soul, the bliss which he doth feel,
Are number'd with the secret things which God will not reveal.
But I know (for God hath told me this) that he is now at rest,
Where other blessed infants be, on their Saviour's loving breast.
I know his spirit feels no more this weary load of flesh,
But his sleep is blessed with endless dreams of joy for ever fresh.
I know the angels fold him close beneath their glittering wings,
And sooth him with a song that breathes of Heaven's divinest things.
I know that we shall meet our babe, (his mother dear and I,)
Where God for aye shall wipe away all tears from every eye.
Whate'er befalls his brethren twain, *his* bliss can never cease;
Their lot may here be grief and fear, but *his* is certain peace.
It may be that the tempter's wiles their souls from bliss may sever,
But, if our own poor faith fail not, *he* must be ours for ever.
When we think of what our darling is, and what we still must be;
When we muse on *that* world's perfect bliss, and *this* world's misery:
When we groan beneath this load of sin, and feel this grief and pain,
Oh! we'd rather lose our other two, than have him here again."

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

HARE'S SERMONS TO A COUNTRY CONGREGATION.

(Continued from page 467.)

SEVERAL correspondents have addressed us upon the subject of Mr. Hare's sermons reviewed in our last Number, expressing great interest in the extracts from them, but wishing to learn more clearly our opinion of their doctrinal character. Now we explicitly premised that we did not take up the volumes "with a view to doctrinal discussion," but for the sake of "offering a few remarks upon the general style and structure of sermons;" as we considered that "they afford some highly important lessons in the valuable art of simplification." We said, "Firmly believing that the simple faithful preaching of Christ crucified, in all the scriptural largeness of that phrase, is that which God honours and blesses, to the conversion of sinners and the edification of the faithful, we may still lawfully inquire whether in the style and structure of pulpit compositions there is anything which, humanly speaking, detracts from their efficacy." For this purpose Mr. Hare's discourses were very convenient, but we did not pledge ourselves to every doctrinal statement in them; as we thought would be evident from the tenour of our remarks. Such passages as those which we quoted at p. 461 appeared to us clearly and forcibly to embody "the great truths of the Gospel;" though, as the sermons are not so much doctrinal discussions as practical applications of doctrine to the heart and life, doctrine is often rather implied than expressed. The question, however, has been put to us, "Are these discourses really Scriptural in their statements respecting original sin, justification, the effects of baptism, and various other controverted points?" As we took up the volumes for another purpose, we are unwilling to be forced to make the work a thesis for controversial argument, especially as the author is no longer alive to explain or vindicate his meaning. There are various statements in which we cannot agree with him; and yet in some other part of the volume, perhaps in the same sermon, we may find a recognition of the very truth which appeared to have been contravened, or a supply of what was omitted. The following passage, for example, from the sermon on "Who are the children of God?" is noticed by one of our correspondents as calculated to lead persons to false security by unscriptural dependence upon the sacrament of baptism.

"I have often tried to fix your thoughts on the great mercy and goodness of God, in calling us to be his children, and adopting us into his family. This mercy was shewn to every one of us at our baptism; wherein, as the Catechism teaches us, each of us was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. What a dignity and glory it is to be thus admitted into God's family, to be thus made sons of God, is clear enough of itself. If it were not, St. Paul might open our eyes to it, by those few striking words, 'If we are children, then are we heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ:' that is, if we are indeed the children of God, we shall receive a share of his heavenly inheritance, together with Christ, our elder brother.

This passage certainly appears to link our being children of God so exclusively with baptism, that it might seem absurd to inquire further whether we are really *rege-*

nerated. Yet in the very next paragraphs we read as follows :—

"Now, seeing that the glory and happiness of being God's children is so very great, it most deeply concerns every one to find out and assure himself, whether he is in deed and in truth one of those blessed children. For the promise of the heavenly inheritance is made, not to those who call themselves God's children, but who are so. A man may dream he is God's child, when he is the child and servant of the devil: just as the captive in the dungeon may dream that he is a king upon a throne. But the dream does the captive no good: it does not make him a king: it does not deliver him from his dungeon. Nor will dreaming that we are God's children make us so."

"But perhaps you will tell me, there can be no dream, no doubt, no mistake about the matter. We have all been christened: therefore we must all be children of God, and heirs through Christ of eternal life. This, or something like it, is a very common notion. It is very common for persons to lull their conscience, when it gives them any sharp and friendly warning, with some such thoughts as these: 'Well! after all we are Christians; and Jesus Christ is very merciful; and we read, he came to save sinners; and I am sure I wish to do my best; and I come to church whenever I can conveniently: and I never did any body any hurt; and so I trust that my soul will rest in peace.' With some such heap of excuses many stifle their conscience, when it is warning them for their good. Yet these excuses, if we sift and examine them, are only so much chaff at top, and sand at bottom—a mixture of foolishness and lies, without any worth or substance. That the man is truly and really wishing to do his best, when in fact he never troubles himself about the matter,—that is the lie. That we are to be pardoned and saved for Christ's sake, without repentance and amendment, when the Scriptures say that, 'except we be converted, and become as little children, we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. xviii. 3);—that we are to be saved for coming to church, and doing no harm, when the Scriptures say that we 'must be doers of the word, and not hearers only' (James i. 22);—and again, in another place, that 'without holiness no man shall see the Lord' (Heb. xii. 14);—this is the foolishness. But the greatest folly of all is, for a man to call himself a Christian, when perhaps the greatest proof he ever gives of being so is bowing his head to Christ's name when he hears it read in church, and taking it in vain whenever he utters it out of church. Do such people never read, never listen to the word of God? Do they not remember those warning words of John the Baptist? 'Say not within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father' (Mat. iii. 9); and those words of St. Paul's? 'He is not a Jew, who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh' (Rom. ii. 28). How many other passages too are there, which prove that no man can be saved by words and outward professions; that God looks not to what we call ourselves, but to what we are; and that, if we live the lives of heathens, we are heathens in his sight, and nothing else;—yea, the very worst of heathens, because we might have been better if we would, because we have had the gospel set before us, which many of the poor heathens never had."

"But if neither the having been baptized, nor the being called Christians, nor any other outward mark or privilege, can be relied on as a proof that we are God's children, is there any sign by which a plain man can tell for certain whether he is a child of God? Yes; there is a sure sign: St. Paul mentions it in the text: 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.' Here is the sign which St. Paul gives us, and which must settle the matter. If we are led by the Spirit of God, then are we God's children: but if we are not led by the Spirit of God, then most assuredly we are not God's children. The honest inquirer, however, may still go on to ask, How am I to know whether I am led by the Spirit of God or not? To answer this question, I will lay before you a few plain rules for trying your spirits, and for examining yourselves whether you are indeed led by the Spirit of God; in other words, whether you are walking under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.—First, I would have you look which way you are travelling. Are you going along the broad road to destruction, or along the straight and narrow path of life," &c. &c.

We judged from such passages as the above, that though Mr. Hare considered, and rightly, all baptised persons to be professed or visible members of Christ's kingdom; yet that baptism does not really and practically determine "who are God's children;"

and this conclusion was strengthened by the following, and other similar passages :—

"The kingdom of God, for the coming of which we are to pray, is a threefold kingdom. There is his kingdom and authority over the souls of all true believers; which we will call his spiritual kingdom. There is his kingdom upon earth, or his Church; which we will call his visible kingdom; because it is visible to all men, and all may see it. Lastly, there is his heavenly kingdom, which is to come after the resurrection, and to last for ever. Now with each of these three kingdoms we have all a great deal to do.

"We have to do with Christ's spiritual kingdom: because, if he does not first reign in us, he will never reign over us, at least with our own consent," &c.

"But we have also to do with God's visible kingdom, that is to say, with the Church of Christ. Of this blessed institution it would require the tongue of a prophet or an apostle to speak worthily. It is the best and most glorious thing on earth. Our Lord, as St. Paul tells us, purchased it with his own blood: he hallowed it with his Spirit: he taught it by his apostles: ever since his death he has continued to watch over it, and to keep it from the powers of darkness, down to the present day: and he still enlightens and guides it by his word and by his ministers, and enriches it with his sacraments and with his grace. Such is God's visible kingdom, which our Lord left behind him to serve him, and to bear witness of him upon earth. This is the city set upon a hill, which cannot be hid. It is the city of Zion, a fair place, and the joy of the whole earth, in whose courts God is known for a sure refuge. But, if this be God's visible kingdom, who are the people of it? We are. We, and every other person who has entered into a covenant with God and Christ by baptism, who acknowledges the truth of his holy word, and professes to receive Christ as his Lord and Saviour, —we are all the people of that sacred kingdom. Therefore our dissenting brethren belong to it as well as we. They, like ourselves, are baptized into the faith of Jesus: they, like ourselves, profess to take the Bible for their guide: they, like ourselves, own Jesus for their Lord and Saviour. Therefore it would be unjust and uncharitable to deny that they are God's people as well as we. Whether they act like his people, in separating from their brethren on such small grounds as most of them bring against us, is another question, which I will not speak of now."

"Wherever Christ is worshipt, wherever his sacraments are administered, wherever salvation is preached through faith in him, there is a branch of the Church of Christ, there is a portion of God's visible kingdom, which, as David sings in the 48th Psalm, is appointed to be the joy of the whole earth."

These extracts, we trust, will suffice to shew that though we did not pledge ourselves to every statement in this publication, it did not necessarily call for a controversial discussion, especially as we explained that we took it up for another purpose. We do not, however, regret that some of our correspondents have addressed us on the subject, as our recurrence to the work gives us the opportunity of transcribing a few more passages which our limits did not allow of our inserting last month. We select some, which, besides bearing upon the inquiries of our correspondents, are so striking and interesting that they will amply repay perusal. They evince an affectionate solicitude, and simplicity of aim, which go directly to the understanding and the heart. Thus, in the preface to a sermon which the author printed as a tract to distribute among his flock, he says :—

"Believe me, the matters spoken of in this address do concern you all very nearly indeed. Even the affectionate regard for you, my beloved friends and neighbours, which, I hope, every page breathes,—even this will have its spiritual use, if it raise your thoughts from the feeble and imperfect love of one who is a sinner like yourselves, to the surpassing, the divine, the all-perfect love of our common Master and Saviour Jesus Christ, who loves us, and gave his life for us, to redeem us, and win us to himself. This is the great, the heavenly point, on which it is the duty of a Christian minister to fix his people's hearts and minds, even on the love of Christ for them, and his desire to see them numbered among his true and faithful servants. Unless we do this for you, we do nothing for you worth doing. My preaching, my writing, my very living among you, and

serving God's house and altar,—all these things will be useless, and worse than useless, to your souls, unless they raise your thoughts to Christ, and lead you through him to God the Father."

We will now extract some miscellaneous passages as they occur in the volumes.

Grace and Peace.

"If a man's conscience will not allow him to have peace, whither shall he betake himself to find it? Shall he go to his natural reason, to that reason by which the affairs of mankind in this world are ordered and controlled? That will tell him, that, according to the laws of man, every offence has its set punishment. It is is no excuse for a person who has broken any one law, that he has kept fifty others. When a man is tried for a robbery, it is of no avail for him to plead that he has never murdered anybody; nor, if he is tried for stealing, that he is not a highway-robber; nor, if he is tried for a riot, that he is not a thief; nor if he is tried for poaching, that he is not a rioter. A man is bound to keep all the laws. If he breaks any one of them, and is found out, he may be brought to punishment: nay, he is sure of meeting with it, unless from something out of the common way, such as his youth, or the pettiness of the injury, or its being a first offence, he is lucky enough to get a pardon. But can any one say, he never offended God, except when he was very young and knew no better? Can any one say, he has offended God only once, and in some small matter? If there be such a person, natural reason might perhaps encourage him to look for pardon at God's hands. But we all know, there is no such person in the world, nor ever was. We all know, if we know anything about the matter, that in many ways, and at every season of life, in childhood, in boyhood, in youth, in manhood, in old age, all have offended, and all are still offending God; some of us more indeed, and some less, but all frequently, and all grievously and inexcusably. We know that every man has broken God's law, knowingly and wilfully, over and over again. That law too is a perfect law: and the lawgiver is one whom there is no deceiving or escaping. What peace then can reason bestow? Its sentence must be, Thou hast broken the law; 'therefore thou must abide the penalty of the law."—

"Here then we have the sinner, when he becomes aware of his guilt,—and when I say the sinner, I mean you, I mean all, for all are sinners,—going for hope, for comfort, for peace, to conscience and reason: but he gets no hope, or comfort, or peace from them. Conscience tells him, 'I have no peace to give thee, because I know thee to be a sinner.' Reason tells him, 'I have no peace to give thee, because thou hast broken the law; and he who breaketh the law, shall be broken by the law.' And if, in the hope of getting a milder answer, he takes up the Old Testament, he there finds many offers of pardon, it is true, and many promises of mercy; but he also finds the most terrible threats against every kind of iniquity; he finds story after story of God's fearful judgments against sinners; above all, he finds a covenant of works too perfect for man to keep: and he reads those words so appalling to a sinner, who is seeking after peace; 'There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.' How then is he to find peace? He cannot find it for himself: nothing on earth can give it him: he must receive it therefore from above: it must come to him as a free gift from God. That is, it must come to him by grace. If God is graciously pleased to offer us his free pardon, and to take us back into his favour, then, and then alone, can we have peace."

Doctrines of Grace.

"Are we to follow the example of the Roman Catholics, and to hold back any doctrinal or practical part of Scripture, especially so important a part as St. Paul's Epistles, from the people, as too hard for them? That would never do. The great doctrines of justification by faith alone, of forgiveness for Christ's sake, of our being unable to earn God's favour by anything we can do, and of our being too weak and corrupt to take one step toward holiness, except by the assistance of the Holy Spirit,—these great doctrines are the very foundations of Christianity. They are the very things to give us that sense of sin, that distrust of ourselves, that feeling of entire dependence on God, that love for the Father and the Son, which are the springs and fountains of all Christian living. These things, moreover, are quite as necessary to be taught now, as at any former time: because human nature is not changed; and men are still just as apt to value themselves on their merits, and to make light of their sins, and to think little about God, as they ever were of yore. Therefore, being still prone to the same proud fancies and conceits, we have still need of the same good lessons, to shew us our natural vileness and nothingness in the sight of God. But these lessons are taught more fully, more clearly, and more con-

vincingly in St. Paul, than in any other part of the Scriptures."

Christ's gifts.

"Of the spiritual gifts, which you ought to covet, the chief is the new heart and the new spirit, which are the mark of God's true children. None can be truly a child of God, unless he has been born of God. Now he that is regenerate, or born again of God, receives what the Bible calls a new heart. Thus it is written in the book of Ezekiel: 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes; and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.'.....

"The new heart and new spirit, which Christ gives to his people, must surely be very precious. Nor can you be ignorant what is meant by it. Nicodemus indeed, when our Lord told him that man must be born again, was simple enough to ask, 'How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?' But none can be so simple now-a-days. Were such a question to be asked by any one now in a Christian land, it could only be out of mockery and profaneness. When the Bible or the preacher speaks to you of this new heart and new spirit, none of you can be at a loss to understand, that by the new heart is meant a new feeling, leading to such a change in our affections,—and by the new spirit a new principle leading to such a change in our conduct,—that the alteration could scarcely be greater if we were made altogether anew. What then is this new feeling? what is this new principle? which Christ is ready to bestow on every one, when he has accepted his offer of pardon, and has forsaken his sinful courses, and is trying to live as the Gospel commands, and has begun to pray regularly, and to read his Bible, and to listen to sermons,—when, in short, he has taken all those first steps which betoken a man's repentance, and shew that he is anxious about his soul. A man in this state will soon find how incapable he is of attaining to that inward purity and truth which the law of God requires.....God is ready to deliver you from your thraldom through Jesus Christ our Lord. He is waiting to be gracious, if you will only ask him. Therefore, instead of despairing, and giving yourselves up for lost, and slackening your prayers as of no avail, redouble them. Pray to Christ your King; tell him that you need his gifts, that you need a new heart, that you need a new spirit; beseech him for his mercy's sake to send them to you, that you may be delivered from the bondage of your evil nature. Pray thus to our Lord and Saviour; and be assured, he will hear you, and ere long will send you the new feeling and the new principle which are to change and better your nature.

This brings me back to the question which I asked a while ago: what is this new feeling and this new principle, which are powerful enough to work such wonders, as to change the very wishes of our hearts, and to make our thoughts and lives savour of heaven? The principle is faith, that faith in praise of which St. Paul is so full and frequent."

"Christ has another equally powerful gift in store, in the shape of a new feeling to purify and strengthen our hearts, just as faith enlivens and strengthens our souls. This new feeling is love, the love of God, which marks the new-hearted or Christian man, just as the love of self marks the old-hearted or worldly man. Now this love and this faith may exist in Christians in almost every degree. There are babes in Christ, as well as grown men. But even babes live, and have a spirit and principle of life in them, and learn to love their father and mother, long before they have learnt to say so. Thus must it be with babes in Christ. Even they must have a principle of faith and a feeling of love toward God. If they have not, if they have not this new spirit, and this new heart, which always goes along with it, the Christian life has not even begun in them. Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, and examine yourselves, whether you really love Christ, whether you have a hearty trust in God. Unless you have these only certain signs of a Christian life in you, your Christianity is a dead letter and an empty show."

Praying with the Spirit.

"This then is the way to get to pray with the spirit. We must ask for the spirit to pray with: and that not once or twice, but constantly, regularly as for our daily bread, unceasingly, so as to take no denial. If we do this, God from time to time will pour down a fresh supply of that best gift of his, 'the spirit of grace and supplication.' Observe the order of the name, that it is first the spirit of grace, and then the spirit of supplication. From the spirit of grace we receive whatever is more closely connected with the covenant of grace, that is, with God's offer of free pardon to all who will repent and turn to him for the sake of his crucified Son. Thus by the spirit of grace we are taught, in the way I explained to you above, to feel first the great evil

of sin, and then the love of Christ in dying for us. By the same spirit we are filled with a grateful love to God and to his Son for this their marvellous loving-kindness. Lastly, by the same spirit are opened on our souls such views of the perfection we ought to aim at—such bright glimpses of the graces we ought to seek,—such as the grace of holiness, the grace of patience, the graces of meekness, and temperance, and brotherly love, and self-denial,—that, while we feel our natural want of power, to attain to such heavenly heights of godliness, our souls are nevertheless stirred to long for them and strive after them, knowing that, though without God we can do nothing, yet by his help we can do all things. These thoughts and feelings the spirit of grace awakens and kindles in us; and by so doing it becomes the spirit of supplication. For it is as impossible, when the fire is put to the wood, that the flame and smoke on a clear day should not rise upward, as that, when a heart is warmed by these holy feelings, the sweet incense of fervent prayer should not rise from it to God the Father. Rather will such a man always be offering, not the offering of his lips indeed, but the far more precious one of his heart. His thoughts, his feelings, his hopes, his wishes will at all times look and soar heavenward. As the excellent Bishop Taylor has beautifully expressed it, his whole life will be one continual prayer."

God's Will, not ours.

"By teaching us to pray that God's will may be done, or, in other words, by teaching us that we are to strive to make God's will our own, which of course is the thing meant, Jesus struck at the taproot of the evil in our fallen and corrupted nature. The great mischief of the fall of Adam was, that it burst the golden chain which bound man to God. Man broke loose from God, and made himself independent of him, and left the safe and the straight way of his commandments, to walk in the light of his own eyes, and after the devices of his own heart. In short, man at the fall set up his own will against God's; and so his will became corrupt and tainted, as everything must become when God's purifying Spirit leaves it. Man set up his own will. This is the great disease and the main evil of our nature. It comes to us from our parents: it shews itself soon after our birth: and the seeds of it continue to lurk, even in the best of men, as long as they remain in the body.

"The disease, I say, shews itself soon after our birth. If you doubt this, look at infants. Mark how violent and fretful they become, even while they are still in arms, if you do the least thing to cross them. But perhaps you will say, 'They are only babies, and don't know any better.' Well! wait till they do know better; wait till they are five or six years old. Is the matter improved then? You know that, generally speaking, it is not. You know that your complaint of your child at six years old is the same that it was at fifteen months: 'The child will have its own way.' You are quite right: the child will have its own way, unless you take great pains to teach it better. And when it grows up to be a boy, it will try to have its own way as a boy: and when it grows up to be a man, it will try to have its own way as a man. Nay, at threescore and ten, if God spares its life so long, unless its heart has been renewed before-hand, we should still have the very same story: we should still see the old man, with white hairs on his head, and a crutch in his hand, and one foot in the grave,—if we could read his heart, we should still see him making a point of having his own way."

"Now what is the cause of all this? What is the cause of this desire, which shews itself in us at all the different stages of life, from the earliest down to the latest? What is the origin of this distempered feeling, which stands us instead of reason, and which will often lead a man to act against his plain interest? The cause is that unreasonable and corrupt self-will, which we have all inherited from Adam, which shews itself differently in different men, but which in some way or other is sure to shew itself in every one not thoroughly converted."

Forgiveness of Sin.

"Sin—when a man is in his right senses, when he knows whither he ought to be going—is a weight on the soul, and presses it down, just as a weight on the back presses down the body. Many of you must have read or heard of poor Christian in the Pilgrim's Progress, how, after he had read a while in a book given him by one, Evangelist, that is, after he had studied the word of God, he felt a burthen on his back so heavy that it almost bowed him to the earth. That burthen is an allegory to express the painful weight of sin, which is indeed a burthen to the awakened conscience, yea, a sore burthen too heavy for it to bear. When thus overweighted with the sense of guilt, how can the Christian warrior march forward? Nay, under such a load, how can he act the soldier in the field? A man who fights, needs to be nimble and strong, and should have all his limbs

free and unshackled. He must not go into battle tottering under a load: else a slight thrust will push him over, a slip will lay him on the ground."

"While a sense of guilt is lying heavy on a man, I said, he cannot, at least he will not, serve God to good purpose. He will not move forward on the road to heaven: he will not stand his ground against temptation. The children of this world indeed tell a different story. According to them the forgiveness of sins so freely offered to sinners in the New Testament only encourages men to sin on. And so it may some. There may be, and I fear there are, persons so wretched and so foolish, as to abuse the blessed doctrine of forgiveness through the blood of Christ, to the dishonour of God, and their own ruin. There may be, and I fear there are, persons who think to take advantage of God's mercy, and put off repenting year after year, saying to themselves, 'We shall have time to repent by and by.' Thus they go on, until God's judgment falls on them, and death overtakes them with all their sins unrepented of, and gives them over to judgment and to hell."

"But, though the doctrine of free forgiveness to all who sue to God for mercy through the blood of Christ may be thus perverted and abused, it is still a blessed and a holy doctrine, and is well fitted to make men holy..... Would you set the man free? You must break the chain: and that can only be done by forgiveness. If you ask me how sin is a chain, I answer, it is like a chain, because it hangs about a man, and clogs him, and hinders him from seeking God. None of us like to go to a person, to whom we know we have given just cause of offence. The sight of such a person is irksome to us: we feel awkward and ill at ease in his company: we stay away from him as much as we can: if we are forced to go to him, we feel it a relief to get away again. So it is between man and man: so too is it between man and God. While we believe God to be offended with us, while our consciences tell us that we are at variance with him, we cannot be at ease in his presence. We dare not think of him: we dare not pray to him: we get away from him as far as we can. This is no new effect of sin: it has been so from the beginning. After Adam and Eve had committed the first sin, by eating the forbidden fruit, we read, that they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden. Now mark what follows: 'And Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called to Adam, and said to him, Where art thou? And Adam said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.' Naked he was indeed, with the worst of nakedness: his soul was naked; it was lying bare and open with the black stain of sin upon it; and Adam felt that it was so. This was the nakedness he was afraid of. He could not bear to feel the eye of God looking on that black spot; so he went and hid himself. And do not sinners in the present day just the same? Do they not try to hide themselves from God in business, in pleasure, in revelings, in idle company? Do they not try all means in their power to fly from their own thoughts, and from their own conscience? Do they not hate and dread serious self-examination above all things? because they know that in such moments God causes his presence to be felt; and they are afraid to feel that God is looking on them. They cannot bear to tear the rag off from their festering sins: they cannot bear the torture of probing their hearts: they cannot abide the shame of seeing and knowing how bad their condition is. So they turn away from all serious thoughts of God in private, and from all serious talk about him with their neighbours. They shun all self-examination, and shut their eyes to their danger, with the desperate cowardice of a ruined man, who will not face a creditor nor look into a bill, nor cast up an account-book. How must this end? How does it always end with those who dare not face their earthly creditors? Common sense and experience tell us: sooner or later in utter ruin. How then must such a course end with those who have God Almighty for their creditor? Reason and conscience unite to tell us: sooner or later in utter ruin. The man who will not look into the state of his affairs in this world, must be ruined in this world: the man who will not look into the state of his soul, must be ruined for ever.

"Here are two sad truths plainly made out, that the consciousness of being sinners keeps man away from God, and that, in keeping away from God, we keep away from happiness: in turning from him, we rush into ruin. How was this evil to be remedied? Looking at it with the eyes of a man, one should have said, there was no way. For the more men became sinners, the more need they had of God: yet the more they became sinners, the more afraid they were of coming to him. But God seeth not as man seeth: in the depths of his merciful wisdom he disco-

vered a remedy for the evil. That remedy, in one word, is forgiveness. He has come to us in the person of his Son, and has called to us in the midst of our sinful courses, saying, 'Why will ye die? I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth. Only turn to me, and ye shall live.' Return to the Lord, and he will have mercy upon you; return to our God, for he will abundantly pardon you. This is the plan which our Father has devised for melting the stubborn naughtiness of men's hearts."

"He who is labouring and fainting under the burthen of his sins will creep to the cross of Christ to be rid of his burthen. But he who does not feel the lump of sin to be a deformity and a disgrace to him, he who does not desire to run the race set before him, and therefore does not feel the weight of those offences, which make him crawl, instead of running,—these men of course will not be anxious to be freed from a burthen which they do not feel: they will not be anxious for God's forgiveness: because they are not aware that they need it. The first lesson for us all to learn, then, is the evil and wickedness of sin. We must get a sense of our own unworthiness and guiltiness in the sight of God. Now this can only be done by a diligent study of the Bible, especially of the New Testament. Everything in the world about us is fitted to stupefy us, and to blind us to the true nature of sin. In the world it wears a mask and a disguise. But in God's book it appears without a mask: we may see it there in all its hideousness. It is spoken of there, as they speak of it in heaven, and as Christ will speak of it when he casts it into hell."

"As a man in a fever tosses and turns about from side to side, seeking rest for his body, and finding none, so would it be with the awakened sinner, were he not supported by hope during the trial and struggle of his change. The terrors of the Lord would frighten him into repentance; and then the weariness of repentance would carry him back to sin. So the poor wretch would be driven backward and forward, never resting, yet never getting on. This is even now the state of many, in spite of God's promises: and it would be the state of all, if Christ had not saved us from it. But his promises and invitations are so clear and gracious, that many a poor soul is encouraged by them to persevere in the work of repentance, painful as it may be: until at length God causes his mercy to shine forth on him, like a sunbeam from a stormy cloud, and speaks peace to his wounded spirit; and so the sinner knows himself to be forgiven; and hastens on his way rejoicing. In a word, as it happened to the paralytic man, so does it happen to us. When Christ had said to him, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee; arise and walk,' he arose, and took up his bed, and went to his home. Thus we too are naturally palsied and lame and halt with sin: but when Jesus says to us, 'Repent, and your sins shall be forgiven,' we too are strengthened and encouraged to arise and walk in the paths of righteousness. We leave our burthen of sin behind us, and take up our bed, and carry it along with us: that is, in our duty we find our rest.

"Let none of you say within himself, 'This is all very well for gross and open sinners: but it does not apply to decent, well-behaved persons, such as I am.' Remember that a man may sleep upon his burthen, instead of carrying it; and then to be sure he does not feel it. Yes, he may so sleep, and may even dream that he is moving onward: but he who moves only in a dream, will not make much way. Besides, his dream must come to an end: he must awake at last. Does not St. John tell us, that 'if a man says he has no sin, he deceives himself, and the truth is not in him?' Does not St. James say, 'In many things we all offend?' Surely these texts are plain enough. He who has never felt the burthen of his sins, and his need of pardon, will do well to ponder and consider them. Want of feeling is no proof of life and health, but the contrary."

Character of Christ's Disciples.

"Instead of expecting to be saved by his works, the true Christian puts his trust in Christ alone. He knows that in Christ Jesus neither baptism, nor coming to church, nor any other form or ceremony, can avail anything of itself, but a new creature. He feels that to become a new creature is a task beyond his power, that he cannot make himself over again. Therefore he prays for the Spirit of God to create him anew after his heavenly Father's image, in righteousness and true holiness. Again, instead of being satisfied with himself, and thinking he can earn God's favour by leading a virtuous life, he knows that if he lived the best life that ever mortal man lived, he should still be an unprofitable servant. He is conscious too how far his own life falls short of that test. Therefore, instead of being satisfied with himself, and thinking he has done enough, he is anxious to grow better, and *to push forward*. And why does he wish this? Not from believing God to be a hard and cruel master; but because he desires to become more like him; because he wishes to shew his

dutiful love toward him by keeping his commandments; and because this is the only return he can make for all that his Saviour suffered on his account.

The above extracts will shew the character of Mr. Hare's sermons; in which there is much of doctrinal indistinctness, though combined with such solemn warnings, affectionate and fervent appeals, practical Scriptural exhortations, and truly evangelical statements, that no reader can doubt the conscientious anxiety of the writer "to declare the whole counsel of God." We should gladly have seen in these discourses more frequent and distinct statements respecting the person and offices of the Redeemer; the grounds of a sinner's justification before God; and many other things which the writer rather assumes, or occasionally alludes to, than constantly sets forth. We are aware that in what are called doctrinal sermons there is often a sort of routine of topics—especially the momentous points of the Fall, the Atonement, Justification, Regeneration, and the fruits of faith—but discussed didactically, rather for the correction of error than embodied in the business of actual Christianity; so that persons often come to have a very lucid idea of what is called, and not incorrectly, if not exclusively, "the scheme of salvation," without being brought into the frame and spirit of Christians. Such preaching, though intended to supply a defect, is itself defective; for to rest in a notion, even a good notion, is not religion; nor is correct phraseology piety. The defect intended to be supplied is that of ignorance or mistake respecting the character of the Gospel as a revelation of mercy; but there is also a defect, when it is not fully brought out as a code of holy obedience. A divine of another class seems to say, "It is of no use to be talking about religion; I want men to be religious; you tell them that they must be justified by faith in order to have peace with God; that is perfectly true, and I always suppose, and not seldom urge it; but I am mainly anxious to set them about working out their salvation; you speak of being children of God rather as a state or a privilege—I, as a habit; you of divine grace working for you—I, of the same grace enabling you yourself to work." This may not be a perfectly correct parallel, but it is sufficient to shew our meaning. Mr. Hare, we think, inclines to this latter course. He does not for the most part refer to the case of a penitent asking, "What must I do to be saved?" and to whom the Scriptural answer is, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;" but to the case of one who, as a baptized person, professes to believe in Christ, who calls himself a Christian, but is walking in no good way, and requires, in the opinion of the preacher, warning and exhortation rather than doctrinal teaching. The preaching of either class of divines would probably, in such a congregation as Mr. Hare was addressing, be for the most part elementary; with the difference, that the one would urge chiefly elements of godly doctrine, the other of godly practice; both would wish to "awaken sinners;" but the one would endeavour to promote this awakening by telling men of their perishing condition without a Saviour; the other, of their neglect of the Saviour's commands. We of course speak of divines of true piety; not of formalists or careless shepherds on the one hand, or of antinomians on the other.

There are many intermediate shades; and it is not always easy to classify preachers; and in the case of Mr. Hare, we refrained from any such attempt; not only as in one part or other of his volumes we might point out passages

which do not fall in with the system of any one particular "school," so that we might be doing injustice in relegating him to any; but because our object in that review, as we declared, was to discuss the style, and not the doctrines, of sermons.

We do not indeed blame the jealousy which every good man must feel that nothing should be accredited which is not scriptural; though it would be often well if there were larger consideration in coming to conclusions. But all that we meant to say was, that divines of every school may learn much from Mr. Hare's instructive and straight-forward method of teaching; though they may learn the same lesson in a still better, because perfect, manner, from the parables and other illustrations of Him "who spake as never man spake." Our Divine Lord's discourses are a model which has been too much lost sight of, and to which his ministers would do well to recur. They are always striking and (if we may reverently so speak) business-like; they arrest attention; they are felt and remembered; whereas many discourses which embody truly evangelical doctrine and precept are dry and dull;—not dry and dull because evangelical, but in spite of being evangelical; dry and dull because they are ill-constructed; because the most impressive themes are not brought home to men's hearts, and understandings, and consciences, in an impressive manner.

The warf and weft of the texture of sermons should be the Gospel, the whole Gospel, (understood even when not expressed) and nothing but the Gospel; but the mechanical weaving, so to speak, will differ with the care and skill of the workman; in saying which, we do not overlook the promised grace and influence of the Divine Spirit, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy; but we merely say, in other words, that he qualifies men for the office which he gives them to perform, as he did Bezaleel and Aholiab "to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary," and blesses their labours for the promotion of his glory.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

On the day on which these lines meet the eye of our readers, one great portion of the long delayed measure of justice to the oppressed sons of Africa in the English colonies will be completed:—the apprenticeship of the non-predials will expire; and in the chief of the islands (Jamaica now included,)—perhaps in all—the predials also are to be liberated. We return humble and hearty thanks to God for this blessed, this long-wished for hour. But the friends of the late bondsman are not yet emancipated from their benevolent and Christian exertions. The disfranchised slave needs counsel and protection; and England will have much to do in preventing new forms of injustice and oppression being substituted for the old; and above all, she has a most solemn duty to discharge, in labouring for the spiritual instruction of these disenthralled and grateful captives, in order that by the divine blessing they may become "Christ's freemen."

Mr. Plumptre's Lord's Day Bill has been rejected by a majority of 57 to 45. It is melancholy to think that only 102 members should have voted on such a question; and that the leaders, both of the ministerial and opposition parties, should have absented themselves. Sir Robert Peel's conservatism is not more warm than Lord J. Russell's whiggery, on this question; and a bill to repress Sunday trading is opposed as doggedly as Sir Andrew Agnew's larger proposition. Might not the friends of this holy cause try the experiment of getting a well-digested measure, confined to trading, passed through the house of Lords; leaving to the house of Commons the sin and

odium of venturing to reject this "poor man's bill?" Why might not some prelate bring forward such a measure? It has been said that Sir A. Agnew having proposed a larger bill, it would be unseemly for a bishop to sink down to a less; but surely not so, when the question is not what we wish, but what we can get; provided we yield no Scriptural principle.

We congratulate the Church upon the success of the Anti-plurality Bill; for though unhappily it does not lay down the doctrine that pluralities shall cease, and though some of its details may be objectionable, it will doubtless diminish the evil;—the Bishop of Lincoln is so sanguine as to say to the extent of one half; which, however, is more than we hope for; and indeed, had even Lord Wynford's proposition been adopted, for confining pluralities to contiguous parishes, instead of allowing a range of ten miles, means would still be found by exchanges, and the purchase of advowsons and presentations, to evade its object. *Nothing* but the assertion of a sound principle can effectually cure the evil.

The Church Discipline Bill has been withdrawn by the Archbishop of Canterbury, after a debate which we refrain from describing. Our internecine discussions on this subject, and on ecclesiastical commissions, cathedral dignities and revenues, and promoting Christian knowledge, do not augur well for the moral influence which the church would gain by the proceedings of a convocation.

Lord Ashley's benevolent labours, on behalf of the children in our Factories, have again been frustrated by the worse than apathy of her majesty's ministers, and a majority of the House of Commons; so that till another session, at the least, these oppressed infants must remain under their present heavy yoke. The cruel and exterminating labours exacted from them add greatly to the mass of national guilt engendered by our commercial pride and avarice; and justice, religion, and humanity all cry out against the enormity. At the same time, there is this difference between the case of these "white slaves" and slaves properly so called; that the latter are coerced by law, under the domination of strangers, and for their exclusive benefit; whereas these children are urged on by their half-famished parents, upon the ground that they must either slave or starve; for an abatement in their toils would be followed by a diminution of their wages, which at the utmost scarcely yield them the common necessaries of life. This is the real difficulty, and our statesmen therefore say, "We must leave matters to find their level, lest we make bad worse." We reply, that where a usage is clearly wrong it ought to be repressed. We are not to do evil that good may come. Legislate that these children shall not be killed by work, and means may be devised to prevent their dying of starvation.

We rejoice to say that the expression of public opinion upon the India idolatry question has been so urgent, that her majesty's ministers have pledged themselves that such stringent directions shall be sent out as shall satisfy what they are pleased to call "the most scrupulous minds." We trust that the event will justify this expectation: but in the mean time the efforts of British Christians should be redoubled rather than relaxed; for it is quite clear that the East India Directors will not advance farther than they are forced by external pressure. The details of the question are far too numerous for our present notice; but the reader will do well to refer to Mr. Poynder's speech of 1836, just republished, with an appendix bringing down the mournful history of the question to the present time, and also to the accumulation of appalling facts in a recent pamphlet, "By a late resident in India."

We are thankful that the legislature is beginning to listen to the just remonstrances of the friends of religion, morals, and social order, respecting the evils of Beer Shops. We see no reason to alter the opinion which we expressed at the discussion of the Beer Bill, that the trade in beer ought to be free, so that the consumer may be able to procure a good and fair priced article, but that the beverage should not be allowed to be used on the seller's premises, which prohibition would have prevented the evils complained of.

There seems to be a prospect of several long-litigated Irish questions being arranged.—The Municipal Corporation Bill is in progress; and the Poor Law Bill has passed both houses. We fear that this hazardous experiment, while it oppresses property, will increase instead of diminishing poverty; and that, without being approved either by the rich or the poor, it will just go far enough to establish an unsound principle, from the ruinous effects of which there will be little hope of escape.—

The Irish Tithe Bill has worked its way by mutual concessions through the Commons; and we hope will pass the Lords, as it is freed from the appropriation principle, and embodies the desirable provision of making tithes a rent-charge (though with the unnecessary sacrifice of £25 per cent. to the landlord, who will of course raise his rent when his tenant has not to pay tithe,) and also remits payment of the portion of the million already advanced to the clergy, who have been defrauded of their tithes, and devotes the remainder to their use, not indeed as a boon to them, but in lieu of their much larger claims upon the tithe-payers. It is essential to have these irritating questions settled, even at considerable pecuniary loss, if it can be done without sacrifice of principle. We lament to say that her Majesty's ministers still advocate the spoliatory doctrine; and Lord J. Russell wishes to pay the Romanist priesthood, and regrets that public prejudice will not allow it: and another member of the government, Lord Howick, says that the Irish people will not long tolerate a Protestant Church establishment. If Protestants neglect to observe these and similar signs of the times, and faithfully to discharge the duties which arise out of them, they will incur no little guilt by their ungodly supineness.

We have left the Coronation for our last topic, hoping to dilate upon it, but our space is exhausted. The gorgeous solemnity has passed away; but not the many important lessons which it was calculated to impress upon the mind of every true patriot and thoughtful Christian. It was a festival of warm loyalty and high national elation; and though nearly two millions of persons were collected together in the metropolis, the day glided by with scarcely any occurrence to damp for one moment the general satisfaction. The most painful spectacle, so far as public morals are concerned, was the opening of Hyde Park for a fair, and hiring the theatres, in the French fashion, at the public expense. The fair is indeed stated to have been conducted decently, and the hiring of the theatres is not quite a novelty; but the national countenance thus given to two public abominations is much to be lamented; and more especially in connexion with her Majesty's marked patronage of scenic entertainments. Her own youthful tastes have probably combined with an idea that she is encouraging an elegant and rational popular amusement; but her ministers, and others who have confidential access to her, ought to know that liberty is a stern virtue; and that the frivolities of a court, while they enervate those who revel in them, generate popular discontent, and may lead to the most painful results. Whether we regard liberty, morality, religion, public happiness, or the favour of God, we deprecate the idea of England becoming, like France, a dissipated pleasure-taking nation.

In witnessing the late national solemnity, we could not too highly appreciate the invaluable benefit of our settled national constitution. Without war, distrust, or confusion—nay, with joy and exulting unanimity, the crown descends to a youthful female; law and order are preserved; and her sceptre is grasped as peacefully and firmly as though it were in the hands of the most matured statesman and warrior. We have great cause to bless God for our admirable political institutions.

The coronation service suggests many important lessons; such as the duties of rulers and subjects; and the too much forgotten truth, that as all power springs from God, so those who wield it are bound to establish the worship of God in a land. The Bishop of London alluded most appropriately to some of these topics in his excellent discourse upon the occasion, which he followed up the succeeding Sunday by another on the duty of prayer and intercession for our rulers. We regret that we have not at present room to quote some passages which we had marked for citation, from his Lordship's devout and eloquent addresses, as well as from the well-timed discourses of the Rev. T. H. Horne, and other clergymen, who have published sermons upon the occasion.

The Queen's composed and dignified conduct throughout the solemnity, excited the general admiration of all who witnessed it; and never was a ruler surrounded by more affectionate and loyal subjects. May the prayers of the faithful in the land be fervent that it will please God to preserve her youthful mind from the snares and dangers of her arduous station; and that she may long reign over us, a faithful servant of Christ herself, and the honour and delight of a happy and grateful land.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A.; J. E.; P.; THE CHRISTIAN STUDENT; B. C. S; PHILO-JUDÆUS; R. A.; AN AGED OBSERVER; N. N.; AN INVALID MISSIONARY; PHILO-HEBRÆUS; ALICIA; DIDYMUS; AGATHA; and U. U. S; are under consideration.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. No. 9. SEPTEMBER. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE FATHER OF LIGHTS.—(St. James i. 17.)

For the Christian Observer.

St. James addresses his epistle "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," persecuted and afflicted; and his object is, to minister such topics of consolation as might support them under their trials, and such practical exhortations as might sanctify those trials to their spiritual improvement.

In the hour of temptation the unsubdued heart is apt to entertain hard thoughts of God; to ask, with the murmuring of discontent, rather than the submissive obedience of resignation, Wherefore dost thou contend with me: while I see the ungodly in such prosperity, and coming into no misfortune like other folk? and almost to charge upon God those sins into which persecution and strong temptation have betrayed it. Against this spirit the Apostle guards, by distinctly stating that all sin originates in the depraved will of man, as its moving principle, and flows from the corrupt fountain of the carnal heart. And that although the persecutions which God permits, and the chastisements which He more directly inflicts, may minister occasions of sin, yet that temptation does not create, but only exhibits, latent sin: that the design and tendency of all the dispensations of Providence are not to draw out the corruptions of nature, but to mortify and subdue them, and to develope and confirm the Christian graces: to deepen humility, to strengthen faith, to purify love from every taint of selfishness, to wean the affections from things below and fix them upon things above, to let patience have its perfect work, that the man of God may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."—(James i. 13, 14, 15).

Having thus traced the history of sin, in its origin, its progress, and its end; and having exonerated God from the impious charge of causing those sins which He does not interpose to prevent; he proceeds to assert, that as all evil, moral and physical, all sin and its

attendant misery, are of man alone, so "every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

God is here called the Father of *lights*, in the plural number, to mark that He is the source of *all* light, moral as well as material: not only of that light which gladdens the face of nature, and diffuses life and happiness throughout the natural world; but also of that light of reason and of conscience "which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" and still more, of that special and peculiar light, which illuminates the souls of those, and of those alone, who are "born again of the Spirit;" who are the subjects of that powerful and mysterious operation which makes all things new, and delivers out of darkness and bondage, into marvellous light and liberty. It translates them from the darkness of sin and unbelief, into the light of life and immortality. It delivers them from the fetters of ignorance and superstition; from an enslavement to the tyranny of opinion, and to the delusion of present things; from the power of Satan, and the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

There is here evidently an allusion to the great material luminary, the sun, which is often called by the ancients the father of lights; and most appropriately, as being the fountain of all those lights which the lesser bodies of the system catch from, and reflect back upon, this central parent, fire. The closeness of the analogy between the sun—the source of life, light, and cheerfulness, to the animal and material world—and God—the source of life, light, and cheerfulness, to the spiritual world—is palpable. Paganism attested it, by deifying and adoring this image of the invisible God; and that revelation which tells us that "God is light," uses this metaphor so frequently, as would lead us to suppose that the analogy is closer and more profound than the scanty line of human intellect can fathom.

It is difficult, indeed, to say, whether the Apostle here uses this allusion in the way of contrast, or of comparison; or, indeed, in which view it would be more just and appropriate. He may perhaps intend to *contrast* the sun, with all its variableness and shadows of turning, its perpetual vicissitudes of times and seasons, days and years; its constant alternations of day and night, summer and winter, heat and cold,—all these he may intend to contrast with the immutability of that God who changeth not, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning, but who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

Or he may perhaps intend to *compare* the sun, amid all these apparent revolutions, immoveably fixed, and looking, with calm and undisturbed majesty, upon the other bodies as they revolve around him; amid all this seeming fickleness and inconstancy, unchanged in nature and in attributes; operating by constant and immutable laws; while all those vicissitudes result from the varied aspect which the earth presents to him, from the clouds which interpose, and the various obstacles which obstruct his genial and unvarying influences,—all this he may perhaps intend to compare to God, when sometimes He appears to hide the light of his countenance, to have forgotten to be gracious, and to shut up His loving kindness in displeasure; when he chastens those whom He loves, and scourges the son whom He receives, and seems to withdraw His presence, and to cast out the

timid prayer: yet amid all these seeming fluctuations of the Divine bosom, God is unchanged in nature and in attributes; God is love: God's hand is not shortened that it cannot save, neither His ear heavy that he cannot hear; but it is our iniquities which have separated between us and our God, and our sins have hid His face from us that He will not hear. The change is not in God, but in man. No angry temper disturbs, no storm of passion harrows, the calm serene of the Divine bosom; but our sin has generated the clouds and darkness which are round about Him, and obstructs those beatifying influences which unceasingly emanate from this Fountain of bliss upon every creature capable of receiving them. Blessed truth! that with God is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Here is the security of frail and fickle man—I am a God who change not, therefore are my people not consumed. Having loved his own which are in the world, He loveth them unto the end: and that man knows but little of the treachery of his own heart, and of the deceitfulness of sin, who has not often been compelled, in the hour of temptation and spiritual desertion, to rally for comfort, security, and strength, to the faithfulness of a covenanted God; to lay hold upon those cords of loving-kindnesses with which He draws all those whom He has loved "with an everlasting love;" and to stay himself upon a God, in whose bosom infinite compassion blends harmoniously with every feeling which our manifold provocations can elicit, and the full chord of whose affections, the full compass of whose nature, is HOLY LOVE!

It should not be difficult to teach those who are daily recipients of the Divine bounties, what are those good and perfect gifts which come down from above, which are freely bestowed upon a race that daily flings back the choicest and most perfect with mad ingratitude, and that daily forfeits all by the apostacy of its nature, and its enmity against the Blessed God; while yet, manifold as the compassions of the Divine bosom, they daily meet us at every point to which we would turn away from them, and in every breath we breathe. If we look at the animal world, throughout all its various gradations, we see man placed above it at an immeasurable distance: nor this merely arbitrarily, by that Divine command which invests him with dominion, but necessarily, by the very constitution of his moral and superior nature. Man fills the mighty chasm in the scale of being between the animal and angelic nature. He is the God of this lower world, and incarnates so much of the Divine image as the contracted faculties of the lower animals can comprehend—the wisdom, the power, the sovereignty, and, in the original design of providence, the goodness of God. Man, too, ardently breathes after some perfect good, some unmingled and satisfying happiness; and to meet this, finds within him, deeply seated, fountains of enjoyment, choked up indeed by sin and misery, within and around him, but which are sometimes unlocked by those pure influences that touch the heart, and penetrate its deepest recesses. Often does the smiling face of nature calm and purify the heart, and lead it upwards from nature to nature's God. Often does the breath of music come as from the distant and long-forgotten past, and gently wake the slumbering associations of memory. And memory itself, by a gracious provision for man's eternal happiness, softens down the asperities of the bye gone path; recovers, in more placid mood, the joy of the past; and extracts from it the

bitters of its sorrows. The sweet accents of friendship, the tender sympathies of benevolence, the soft breathings of the Divine Spirit in the inner man, the still small voice of God,—these will sometimes open springs in the soul, deeper and purer than those which feed the interests of ordinary life; and which it feels assured, were but every obstacle removed, would be, in it, a well-spring of exquisite and unalloyed fecility. He feels too an ardent wish, a fond desire, a longing after immortality; a pledge that it is not his lot to lie down in the dust of earth with the beasts that perish, but that he bears within him a spark of that inextinguishable fire, which, struck from the sun of uncreated light, will burn throughout eternity. He looks too upon the *common* bounties of Providence—the beauties of the landscape, the various accommodations with which earth is furnished, a mansion for angels; and amid these fragments of a ruin where still blooms every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food, he can trace that original paradise which God created for unfallen man, and which the divine presence hallowed and beatified.

Nor should each consider the *peculiar* blessings which he enjoys, whatever may be their immediate and apparent cause, whether purchased by laborious industry, or entailed upon him by hereditary descent, as less directly emanating from the Divine bosom than the common air we breathe, or the common light of Heaven. Health, friends, education, talents, liberty, competence, station, affluence,—as respects these too, may that question of the Apostle be proposed to each, Who made thee to differ from another? and, What hast thou that thou didst not receive? And if any hesitate to call these gifts good; let but their flow be interrupted, let but their enjoyment be suspended, and he will soon learn, from their loss, duly to appreciate the value of their possession.

But all these, excellent as they are in their own nature, and suitable to man, have no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth; all these are as the small dust of the balance, less than nothing, when compared with those *perfect* gifts which flow from redeeming love, and which are essentially requisite to consummate and perfect every other gift of creation, or of providence. For what would man's higher nature confer, without a Saviour, but a capability of intenser misery? What would his ardent aspirations after happiness be, without the communion of the Spirit, but the sighs of despair? What would immortality be, without the love of God, but an eternal hell? Would he not, amid the profusest bounties of providence, pine in wretchedness; or, like the ox fatted for the slaughter, like the horse rushing to the battle, recklessly plunge forward, unwarned and unprepared, into an eternity of sorrow—of sorrow, too, but deepened by its contrast with the gay and thoughtless moments of vanished life? The opportunities of instruction in Divine knowledge; the ordinances of religion and means of grace; the offers of free and full pardon through the atoning sacrifice of a Saviour; the oft repeated warnings of Providence; the checks of conscience; the strivings of the Spirit of God; the means of access to a reconciled God through a Divine and all-prevailing Mediator; the privilege of prayer; the sanctifying influences of Divine grace; the inward witness of the Holy Spirit witnessing with our spirit that we are the children of God;—these are the good gifts which transcend every bounty of creation and providence as eternity transcends time;—these are the perfect gifts, which ripen, and stamp

a value, with every rational and awakened mind, upon every other blessing;—these waft the soul upwards, and link the happiness of men with the felicity of the saints in light;—these elevate and ennoble man's every enjoyment: a new sense is opened in his soul, to which all things tell of God. All thy works, Parent of good, are inscribed with the character of thy name and nature—Love! Mute nature has become vocal in thy service, and all thy works praise thee. The floods clap their hands: the mountains are glad: the little hills rejoice: the valleys laugh and sing. The trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord: the birds sing among the branches. The silent flower appeals to the heart of man, as he walks amid the fields of nature, serene and happy, and asks that he will pour out for it the melody of gratitude and love to the present God. The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handy work. The sun shining in its glory, the moon walking in brightness, secretly and sweetly entice the heart, and the mouth kisseth the hand to the unseen but present God. All things speak of thee. Every enjoyment bears the impress of God and of eternity: and, as the untutored child of nature thought that those stars which philosophy deems worlds of light, were but opes through the blue etherial into the paradise of his gods, so the happiness of the new-born soul is but the faint dawning of a light which will shine more and more unto a perfect and never-ending day. To it, every newly kindled sentiment of joy, and emotion of love, is but a ray from eternity.

But what is the practical conclusion to which this subject brings us? What the practical exhortation which it enforces? Love God! for as respects the first, no less than the second table, all the law is fulfilled in one word—namely this, Love. Love God because he first loved you. Contemplate him as the Father of mercies and God of all comfort; the Author of every good and perfect gift—of creation, of providence, of grace.

> "Look abroad through nature, to the range
> Of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres,
> Wheeling unshaken through the void immense,
> And speak, O man!" . . .

Is not the universe full of the goodness, as of the glory of God? Look within you: how fearfully and wonderfully are you made; the delicate and complicated mechanism of your bodily frame waiting for its impulse on each breath which God supplies. See the moral elements which constitute you man, and whose partial development would convert you into a spirit of darkness, or an angel of light—into a devil or a god! See the chaos of moral contradictions which fiercely contend within you, as though the four winds of heaven strove upon the great deep, and whose respective powers would waft you to the regions of the blessed, or dash you upon the shoals of perdition. And who holds in his hand the storm of *passion* and of *lust?* Who points the helm of the *will* to these better shores? What spirit gently fills the sails of the *affections?* What light guides dark *reason* through this dangerous and perplexed course? Whence are those benign and blessed *influences*, which, uninvited—nay, often resisted—visit your soul? Are they not from above? Do they not come down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning? Look at all the bounties of Providence, and trace so many footsteps of an unseen, perhaps often unacknow-

ledged God. Meditate upon that love with which God so loved the world that he spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all—that love with which Christ loved us, and gave himself for us. View, in Christ, the goodness and the severity of God; against sin, severity—to thee, goodness. View, in Christ, the centre, in which alone all the infinite attributes which radiate from the Divine bosom can again converge—the mercy and truth, the justice and compassion, the righteousness and peace—and where they can again blend in holy love. Steadily contemplate this image of the Invisible God—this brightness of the Father's glory and express image of his person; not merely that you may still the clamours of an evil conscience, but that you may nourish the affections of a renewed heart, and learn of him. In his holy life and conversation, brought down to a level with human faculties, human obligations, human sympathies, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, study to be conformed to his likeness; and by prayer for Divine influences, and faithfulness and diligence in the use of those influences, seek to be changed into the same image, from grace to grace, from glory to glory. Seek that you may be transformed into the likeness of God, your soul renewed in righteousness, after the image of Him who created it. Seek to have the same mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus; like him to be meek and lowly in heart, to be patient and forgiving, docile and submissive, self-denying and benevolent; to be holy as God is holy, perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. Sincerely desire this full salvation. Fervently pray for it. Diligently strive after it. Covet earnestly the best gifts; and who shall fix impassable bounds to the power of Divine grace in your soul? Who shall fix limits to the extent of your attainments in the Divine life, even here below? But, however that may be, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," is the gracious and unequivocal promise of God.

J. M. H.

REMINISCENCES OF BISHOP HALL. No. IV.

(*Concluded from page* 485.)

A FEW reflections will now close the reminiscences of Bishop Hall, suggested by my visit to Norwich.

1. The laborious piety and patient sufferings of the Bishop deserve all commendation, and, so far as we can make them our own, are worthy of all imitation. The remarkable providence which (after calling him from the lowest to the highest place—and there honouring him in a lively and exemplary course of public usefulness) still permitted such a man, and in such times, to be driven into comparative exile, silencing his voice, abridging his influence, and assigning him the path of obscurity and privation in the place of that active course of duty and service in which he "did run well"—all this, it must be admitted, was a mysterious dispensation. It is more or less a trial of our faith when we are called to contemplate "the triumph of the wicked." Yet how much is all this in harmony with the early and later persecutions of the church of Christ, from her first conflicts with ancient heathenism, through all her subsequent trials from modern heathenism! No matter whether we look to the cruelty of the Roman emperors, the hostility of worldly popes, the outbreaks of infidelity

in our own civil wars, or the recent inflictions of evil to which the Irish Church has been subjected, and with which the English Church is threatened; we shall still find it true, that "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution;" and that as the world of unbelievers (under whatever name) have hated Jesus, so have they hated his disciples also—all this is explained by Him who could not err, by assuring us that if his people had been "of the world, the world would have loved his own, but because they were not of the world, but he had chosen them out of the world, therefore the world hated them." (John xv. 19.) It is our privilege, however, as Christians, to know that in spite of all our "wrestling against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness (or wicked spirits) in high places," our armour is divine, and that "the triumphing of the wicked is as short," as the success of the Saviour's cause is certain—

> ——————"But the sword
> Of Michael, from the armoury of God,
> Was giv'n him, tempered so, that neither keen
> Nor solid might resist that edge."

I well remember when the formidable bull of the late Pope against the Bible Society was read in Earl Street, an old lay member of our Committee quietly observed that he "only wished his Holiness would read the second Psalm." It is equally our privilege, as Christians, to remember that the success of the cause of God does not necessarily depend upon the most chosen instrumentality; nothing being more common than to see one general or standard-bearer struck down after another, in the Christian warfare, nor any thing more usual than to observe more good accruing to the scattered troops in consequence, which have thus the better learnt to "cease from man," and to rely the rather upon God, who is not unfrequently pleased to raise up other, or fitter, or more numerous, instruments, to supply the place of those who are called to their rest and reward before they expected to enjoy them, and before we were prepared to surrender them. Let us try, then, to leave it to the great Head of the Church to take care of his own cause, without prescribing to him the precise means, and to feel assured that an "earthen pitcher and a lamp" will do as well or better than "swords or staves," when He is pleased to go out with the three hundred who carry them, in preference to the ten thousand whom *we* should have rather selected and armed for the purpose. (Judges vii. 4, 22.)

2. While it is thus certain that he will "swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth, for the Lord hath spoken it," what a fearful condition must they be in who are found, with Balaam, fighting on the wrong side, by resisting and opposing the people of God! They may no more estimate the consequences of their present conduct, than they can understand the sinfulness of their own character. The Apostle himself, in "the times of his ignorance," "verily thought he was doing God service" by displaying the same unhallowed spirit; but this did not alter the facts of the case, and he afterwards comes to admit that his hatred of the people of God was among the plainest evidences of his guilt and folly. "Lord, when thy hand is lifted up they will not see; but they shall see, and be ashamed for their envy at the people." (Isa. xxvi. 11.)

In the last published volume of Mr. Bradley's Sermons, he observes on the words "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you," &c. "Sometimes God visits these men with his displeasure here, just often enough to shew that he marks well what they are doing, and is displeased with them, but generally he seems to let them alone. The hour for them to receive 'the due reward of their deeds' is not yet come, but it will be measured out to them in fearful abundance when the heavens are opened, and the Son of man is revealed. We all know something of suffering—a few of us think we know of it almost as much as can be known, but the deepest sorrow that any of us have ever felt is no more to be compared with this, than the darkness of a summer cloud with a wintry midnight. There is no measuring or conceiving of it. It is weeping, says Christ, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth. It is called 'a recompence.' They are not only to be visited with suffering, but that suffering is to come upon them as the consequences of their unkindness towards God's people. Their unkindness, it is intimated, will increase their everlasting misery. Wretched they would have been, even if they had left this people alone; their other great sins would have made them so, but they shall be more wretched because they would not let them alone. How little is thought of this solemn truth! we hear 'the hard speeches of the ungodly,' and we think of them as little more than the breakings forth of prejudice, or ill humour, or harmless pleasantry; but there is something, says the Bible, concerning every one of them that will never be forgotten. It has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. There is a recompence of blessing to the righteous who suffer by it, which shall brighten their crown, but there is a recompence of tribulation for that thoughtless man who utters it. 'He shall hear of it again,' says the Lord Jesus, 'when I am revealed.' And how this truth magnifies the love that Christ bears to us! It makes us feel that we have yet to learn what that love is. With a burning world under his feet, and a universe falling into ruin around him, he will come down from heaven as our avenger, grounding his proceedings, as the great Judge of all, on the conduct of men towards *us*, rather than towards *himself*. He will force the whole universe to understand in that hour what he meant when he said to his Israel, 'He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of mine eye.'"

I feel that I can add nothing to these solemn truths, but let Irish papists and English infidels consider them. Let our rulers reflect in time, whether, in pursuing the course on which they have entered, they will not be defying the light of experience which they may equally obtain from the history of the church and of the world in all ages, in reference to the evil of injuring and despoiling that national establishment which their Protestant ancestors defended with their lives, or by obstructing the progress of Divine revelation at the bidding of Romanists or Socinians—all which is but another form of persecution, and perhaps the worst it can assume. Let pious Dissenters especially consider how far they can possibly reconcile their professed attachment to the word of God, with the rancour displayed by too many of them against a church, which, with all her errors, still reverences, circulates, and preaches the everlasting gospel; and is, at all events, a tolerant church, which the church of Rome never has been, and never can be; and yet, will posterity believe that it is

with no other than a church thus bigoted and persecuting, as well as unscriptural in doctrine and practice, that so many professed disciples of our common Lord have been led by party spirit to side, in an hour when the powers of darkness have united all their forces for the overthrow of scriptural truth, and the destruction of her advocates. Will it be now honestly affirmed by any right-minded dissenter that the factious opposition against Bishop Hall and his church was really useful to the cause of truth and religion; and is any one among us now prepared to contend that the silencing of this good man, and the suppression of his invaluable exertions, was a blessing to the country at large? Must not the direct contrary be rather conceded? and why then, I would ask, is this experiment to be tried over again? Has history been written in vain, and do we resolve to use it only as the stern-lights of our vessel, permitting it, indeed, to throw a light over the track which has been passed, but not over that which lies before us? It may indeed be alleged that it is only politically, and not religiously, that this unhallowed union of Dissenters with Romanists and infidels has taken place; but not to say that the enemies of the Church of England, and of the prelacy, at the period of the Commonwealth, would equally have had it believed that they had no dislike to true religion, and only objected to episcopacy as connected with a secular and political system, is it not certain that of late years God has in an eminent degree poured out his Spirit upon Episcopalians? Will it be disputed, then, that of all the times to select for bringing the wild boar into the vineyard, it is just the least fortunate period to have selected the fruitful time of the vintage? If a mere spirit of party can justify to itself such mistaken zeal in a bad cause, and such indiscriminating havoc at the wrong time, will it as easily find its justification at the tribunal of God? and can they be guiltless who would thus lend themselves to the work of destruction, when the good that can follow is at best so problematical, and the mischief so manifest and unquestionable? When the great and good Dr. Watts significantly complains of "burning zeal without her eyes," do certain of his descendants detect no affinity between the misguided partizans of his song and themselves; and can they indeed imagine that his peaceful spirit, had he lived till now, would have ranged itself on the side which they are content to occupy, while they cry, "Down with it—down with it, even to the ground?"

I apprehend that if the lately published Life of Mr. Wilberforce had done no more for the country than to have simply represented to it, in a very lively way, the long suffering of God in preserving our religion and liberty through an unexampled period of suffering and danger, that otherwise interesting and valuable work would not have appeared in vain; and are these the returns of gratitude which the professors of religion who honour his name and memory, are disposed to make for the modern miracle of a deliverance, which some of us indeed are old enough to remember, but of which others cannot be too frequently reminded; when only an Almighty arm could have effected our preservation from the united attempts of a whole world in conflict against us at the same moment, with the prince of darkness at their head? How sincerely do I wish, that every dissenter who dislikes that church to which Mr. Wilberforce belonged, could only have witnessed with me the profound and unaffected devotion and fervour with which he made the responses in our Liturgy, when I had

the privilege of worshipping with him in the church of East Farleigh in the last year of his life, and there of partaking with him the memorials of the dying love of our common Lord and Master? Never can I forget the exemplary and elevated piety of this blessed member of our Church on these occasions, and only did I regret that every one could not witness it as well as myself.

3. The last point which occurs to me is the over-ruling mercy of God in sanctifying affliction to his people in every age. The boast of heathen antiquity can only be realized in the case of the true Christian—"si merses profundo pulchrior evenit." Never did the advantage of trials appear more plainly than in the life and experience of Bishop Hall; and doubtless it was for the illustration of that important principle that such an illustrious public example was permitted to be exhibited to the church and world. Every private Christian can indeed more or less attest from his personal experience, even from the time of David downwards, that "it has been good for him that he has been afflicted;" but when a public servant of the Saviour is called to glorify his Master, the example is no longer "hidden under a bushel." Were it only in the great duty of the *forgiveness of enemies* that the blessedness of affliction were made apparent, this alone would render affliction a mercy, in at once supplying the Christian sufferer with the means of displaying this difficult (and to the merely natural man this impossible) attainment, and at the same time of confirming to himself and others the reality of his Christian profession. And how did the good bishop shine in this particular? Let us endeavour to try ourselves by this rule. We are not, it is true, all called to be exemplary in our sufferings; but do we yet "endure as seeing Him who is invisible?" and more especially are we exercising this indispensable grace of forgiving men their trespasses, when, from the very circumstance of our call to that duty being of a more private nature, we may have reason to hope that the observation of our fellow-creatures has less influence upon our motives, and that faith may therefore find a larger scope for its exercise? "Every man," says the French infidel, "dies well who dies before the public." I only notice the remark, as somewhat illustrating the principle that in the degree that a sufferer in private life is without the sympathy which is connected with martyrdom, he may perhaps be sometimes the rather assured of the simplicity of his motives from that very circumstance: but however this be, we may yet be grateful that the Almighty has not left himself without witness in the case of so many individuals who have been pulled down, like Hall and Bedell, (to say nothing of our Episcopal martyrs) from eminent stations of honour and usefulness, who have yet "glorified him in the fires"—some even in the material, and others only in the metaphorical, fires—of persecution; but, as I have already ventured to suggest, let rulers and others (but more especially *our present rulers*) take care, as they tender their eternal interests, how they in any way, or by any means, increase the number of those who "suffer for righteousness sake;" seeing that "the Lord is the avenger of all such," and that as certainly as "vengeance belongeth unto Him," so he will not be backward to "repay;" no matter how erroneously infidel men may now reckon, and so "count" his "forbearance" so much "slackness."

ZENAS.

ON DOING GOOD TO ALL MEN.

For the Christian Observer.

THE great object of the dispensations of God to mankind is to promote his own glory, and to secure their happiness in this world and in the world to come. To this end, whilst the Scriptures set forth the glorious attributes of the eternal Jehovah, and the inspired writers declare "the wondrous works which he did in their days, and in the old time before them," they also set before us such directions for our conduct as must ensure to us (if we observe them) a great portion of happiness whilst passing through this state of trial, and render us daily more and more fitted for "the inheritance of the saints in light." The stupendous displays of the Divine perfections, and the various precepts contained in the volume of revelation, are intended and calculated to inform us of the character of the great Being with whom we have to do, and to instruct us how to obtain his favour. In short, we are directed to the contemplation of his perfection, and to the observation of his precepts, in order that we may, under the guidance and influence of his Holy Spirit, regain the image of our Maker, which Adam by his disobedience lost, and thus to become the children of "our Father which is in heaven;"—his children, by bearing some, though infinitely distant, resemblance to him, by having in us "the same mind which was in Christ Jesus," his only begotten Son. That even some of the perfections of our Heavenly Father are set forth for the express purpose of our imitation, we may gather from the Scriptures themselves; and the very expression of becoming the children of God implies as much; for, to use the words of an eminent divine (Pearson), "God hath no children unlike himself." Now, if there be one attribute set forth for our imitation more than another, if there be one precept more insisted upon than another, it is that attribute and that precept which recommends to our notice the cultivation and practice of mercy and tenderness to our fellow-men. He "who declares his almighty power most chiefly in shewing mercy and pity" would have us to manifest our love to him by loving, for his sake, "our neighbour as ourselves," and by being merciful after our power. The real servant of God will ever be distinguished from the rest of the world by the obedience which he yields to these and such-like precepts; he feels that it is his duty to comply with them, and he delights in the performance of that duty. He loves mercy, and he does justly, whilst he walks humbly with his God. Whilst endeavouring to walk in obedience to the first and great commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind," he feels and knows that he cannot separate it from the second great commandment, which is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." What a happiness would it be, if all who profess and call themselves Christians had "so learned Christ" as to feel it their duty to cultivate and manifest the Spirit of Him whose name they bear! How anxious should we all be, in that case, to discharge every duty of kindness connected with our situation in life, whether as parents or children, husbands and wives, masters or servants, relations or friends! How solicitous to prove the sincerity of our profession by "the fruits of holiness, righteousness, and peace!"

St. John plainly lays down the test of Christian principle in these words, "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren; he that loveth not his brother abideth in death." And the same principle may be clearly and distinctly traced throughout the whole of the inspired writings. St. Paul, when warning the Corinthians against being puffed up by spiritual pride, in consequence of the distinguished gifts of the Spirit with which the Church of Corinth was endowed, declares that without charity, which is but another name for "love," they are nothing. "If I have not charity I am nothing." The splendid dsecription which he gives of this grace, and the manner in which he explains its operations, at once shew us how entirely it must influence every part of the Christian's conduct. St. James declares the proof of a vital faith to consist in works of love to our brethren; and St. Peter, after laying down a general rule to "honour all men and love the brotherhood," proceeds to point out more particularly how this principle of charity should manifest itself in the various points of relationship in which Christians stand to each other. It would be easy to multiply passages of Scripture, all tending to establish the same point; but enough has been said to prove, that the sincerity and value of our Christian profession may be tried by this test, namely, how we employ the opportunities which our situation in life affords us of doing good unto all men. Now it is very plain that our opportunities will be more frequent, in proportion to the nearness of our connection and the closeness of our intercourse with each other; and if our profession of the Christian religion be sincere—if it be a religion of the heart and not of outward form—these opportunities will be improved accordingly. Parents will be found anxiously bringing up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," as knowing that by so doing they are consulting their highest interests both in time and eternity; whilst, at the same time, they will be so far alive to their worldly interests as to do all that lies in their power to make them good and respectable members of society, as knowing that "he who provideth not for his own household is worse than an infidel; he hath denied the faith." Nor will their affectionate care cease when their children have quitted the paternal roof. The kind affections of a Christian parent will attend them, however distant or however situated, sympathizing with them in all circumstances of sorrow or joy. Children will be affectionately obedient in all things to their parents, grateful for their kindness, and anxious to render them comfortable by every means in their power; and when age and infirmity overtake them, they will not forget their best and earliest friends, but will do all that they can to cheer the evening of their days, and to deserve a dying parent's blessing, and to earn the reward of such as "honour their father and mother." Husbands and wives will be mutually kind and forbearing towards each other, cheerfully bearing each other's burdens, and seeking to promote each other's happiness; on every occasion laying aside all heartburnings and unkindness, and walking together as those who understand the nature, and feel the obligations, of those solemn vows which they mutually pledged to each other before the altar of God. Masters will be found anxious to promote the welfare and comfort of those whom Providence has placed under their care, as knowing that they have "also a Master in heaven," to whom they must render an account of the manner in

which they have discharged their trust. They will seek to give their servants every advantage of religious instruction which may offer, setting them an example in their own conduct of regular attention on the duties of public worship and family prayer; and their personal treatment of them will be that of men who have learned to "do unto others as they would that others should do unto them." So likewise servants will seek to approve themselves to their heavenly Master by a due discharge of their duties to their earthly masters, in all things cheerfully obedient, not only to the "good and gentle," but, as the Scripture directs, "to the froward also;" not wasting their substance or their master's time, but attending to the duties of their station, as knowing that they must give an account of their trust to God, who sees and knows the secrets of every heart and the motive of every action. The same Christian principle which I have described as influencing the conduct of the real servants of Christ in the closer connections of life, will not be without its influence in the more extended relations of kindred, or friends, or neighbours; and each will, according to his ability and opportunity, seek to do good unto to all men. The rich will use their influence and worldly means to relieve the wants and alleviate the sorrows of their less opulent neighbours; mindful of the exhortation of the Apostle, "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate;" as knowing that all that is given them is a talent committed to their charge, and that in proportion to the abundance they possess, and the rank they hold above their fellow men, is their responsibility increased; and that, as Christians, they are bound to use all that they possess for the glory of God and the welfare of men. If influenced by Christian principles, they will learn to regard others (however inferior in station), as brethren in Christ, who has declared, that in the day of judgment he will not overlook an act of kindness done for his sake "to the least of his brethren." So likewise the poor man who possesses the spirit of Christ's charity will be found conducting himself with respect towards his superiors; "rendering honor to whom honor is due," submitting himself for conscience sake; and towards those, in similar circumstances with himself, behaving as becomes a member of the great family of Christ. Persons in this station of life have not in their power to assist their neighbours with much worldly substance; but they have it in their power to show a kind and charitable spirit. A person who is anxious to assist others will find many ways of doing it, and frequently in a manner much more effectual and valuable than if he had much to give. Poor people may often assist their neighbours, who are incapable of helping themselves on account of sickness or the infirmities of old age, by doing something which they know will administer to their comfort. They may sometimes spare a little time to read to them; or on the Sabbath, after they have attended a place of worship, they may sit with them, and tell them what they have heard from the minister, and thus soothe the hour of pain and sickness with the consolations of religion. Whatever station of life the real Christian may occupy, in whatever relation he may stand to others, the spirit which dwells in his heart, and influences his life

and conduct, will manifest itself towards every individual in works of love and mercy, "in all things adorning the doctrine of God his Saviour."

Is this, however, the general character of the professing Christian world? When we look into the world, and mark the conduct of those who have been baptized into the faith of Christ, can we generally trace the fruits of that faith which worketh by love? of that "love which worketh no ill to its neighbour?" Alas! how much do we witness of a directly contrary character! How frequently do we hear parents and children mutually complaining of each other's unkindness! What dissensions do we hear of in families! What heart-burning—what envying—what strife—what malice—what hatred—what variance between those "of whom we might hope better things!" What daily complaints reach us of oppression and wrong—of cruel and unjust dealings! Alas! how little are even the ties of relationship regarded! How frequently do we find that the connection of kindred, instead of being made available for the discharge of duties of kindness, is used as if it gave a licence to do that injury to a relative which the fear of retaliation prevents the aggressor from offering to a stranger! There is nothing which affords a surer test of the spirit by which men are actuated, than their conduct towards those with regard to whom they are bound, not only by the principles of Christ, but also by the ties of kindred, to shew every kindness, and with respect to whom their opportunities of so doing are necessarily numerous. But, alas! instead of being influenced by the Spirit of Christ in their dealing with one another, men seem to be guided by little else than worldly interest; as if, whilst they acknowledged with their lips Jesus Christ as their Lord and Master, they desired to shew, by their conduct and by their actions, that they are the servants of the God of this world. And truly his servants they are, whose commands they follow; his children they are, whose works they do. There is something very touching, in the display of the enmity of the human heart to God, evinced in the unkind conduct of relatives. In such instances men seem to go out of their way to do an unkindness—to use a kind of violence—to resist the claims of nature as well as of religion. It is worthy of remark, that whenever the Scripture would set forth the claims of men to the kind offices of each other, they always make use of a term of relationship, "ye are brethren;" thus shewing that the claim of kindred to kindness is no slight one; otherwise the term would not be used if it did not imply a particular obligation to behave kindly. If it were not so, the Scriptures would scarcely have pointed it out as the perfection of Christian charity, in the command to "love as brethren," to be kindly-affectioned towards one another with "brotherly love." And we know that in the language of Scripture the term is used to express, not only what *we* speak of as the connection of brothers, but the remoter degrees of relationship and kindred. But the "world is at enmity with God;" and we cannot therefore wonder, that the men of the world, in their friendship, prefer their own interests to the claims of relationship and the commandments of God, and to principles of Christian love. Would to God that the same kind of conduct were not manifested by many who would willingly be thought to stand apart from the world. Such however is the deceitfulness of the human heart, such is the strong-hold of sin, that we have to lament

in many, who, from their advantages and knowledge of what is required, ought to set an example to others of Christian conduct—a sad want of those fruits by which the Christian is known, and by which God is glorified in his servants. Now, if the Scriptures describe such fruits as have been above-mentioned, as necessary to the real Christian—if without the Spirit of Christ we can be none of his—if upon looking into the professing Christian world we find that such is not the general character of society—what is the language which Scripture addresses to us? It bids us "come out from among them:" for if, whilst we bear the name of Christ, we are found "conformed to a world" at enmity with him, we shall receive our portion with his enemies. If we live and die in the practice and principles of such a world, our Christian profession is vain. The Judge will profess unto us, in the decisive day, "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity; I never knew ye." Seeing then, brethren, that the vows of God are upon us—that we are baptized into the name of Christ—that we are thereby bound to renounce the world, to believe the articles of our holy faith, to keep God's holy will and commandments—let it be our constant and earnest prayer to God, through Jesus Christ, that he would shed abroad in our hearts the "love of God;" that he would give us his Holy Spirit, that we may become indeed the "children of God," loving him with all our hearts, and for his sake our neighbours as ourselves, carrying with us, into every part of our intercourse with our fellow-men, the Spirit of our Master, who "went about doing good." Let us not be guided in our conduct and actions by selfish considerations, "seeking to lay up treasures for ourselves in this world, where moth and rust doth corrupt;" not seeking our own advantage, but striving to promote the glory of God and the welfare of man; and we may rest assured that if such be our rule of action—such our principle of conduct—"God is not unrighteous, that he will forget our works and labour that proceedeth of love, which love we shew for his name's sake."

May He who has by his holy word taught us, "that all our doings, without charity, are nothing worth," send his Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which, whosoever liveth is counted dead by him. May he grant this for his only Son Jesus Christ's sake.

J. E.

MORAL PARALLELS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THERE is not a more abundant source of fallacy and false reasoning, than that derived from mistakes about parallel cases. Men fall into errors without number, and arrive at false conclusions without end; at one time by admitting cases that ought to be rejected, at another by rejecting cases that ought to be admitted. The first of these fallacies—namely, the admitting a plausible parallel case, and permitting it to be applied to a case to which it is not truly parallel—is so common, and so well understood by persons who can reason at all correctly, that I deem it unnecessary to dwell upon this branch of the subject.

But the opposite error—namely, that of rejecting an argument drawn from a parallel case, which ought to have been admitted (because it is apparently not parallel)—is the branch of the subject which will be here considered. For this kind of false reasoning, when applied to subjects of vital importance, is a most miserable and mischievous fallacy, and one by which men arrive at the most deceptive conclusions.

When one case is brought forward as an argument to bear upon another, if it be not exactly parallel in all particulars, it is very common immediately to reject it as in no way applicable to the case in hand. Now this hasty rejection of the argument may possibly be neither more nor less than a grievous fallacy, tending to throw confusion and darkness over the whole subject. For admitting that a case is not exactly parallel to another which it is brought forward to support, yet it ought not on that account to be rejected without further consideration. For though the case be not exactly parallel, it must stand, with respect to the case it is intended to support, in one of these three distinct relations, all of which deserve to be considered.

1. The points in which the cases are not parallel, may be essential to the argument in hand. In this case, it is evident it ought to be dismissed at once as a bad argument.

2. The points in which the cases are not parallel, may be mere "circumstantials," and not essential to the argument in hand. In this case, the non-parallelism is a matter of pure indifference, and does not affect the argument; and the parallel case ought to be admitted as good.

3. The points in which the cases are not parallel, so far from weakening the argument, may possibly make it much stronger than if they had been parallel. They may possibly be so related as to constitute the "argumentum à fortiori." My argument in this case may be of such a nature, that, on a clear understanding of the bearings of the subject, I may be entitled to say, "If the point for which I am contending be true in the parallel I have brought forward, much more is it true in the actual case in hand, upon which I have brought it to bear, which differs from it in such and such respects." Suppose, for instance, two parties were disputing whether a man ought to be put to death for murder, and I brought forward an instance in which the disputants had acknowledged that a man had been put to death, and in their opinion very properly, for an assault and midnight robbery committed upon themselves; and suppose one of the parties said, "Oh! but the cases are not parallel; we are speaking of a case of murder, not of robbery;" should I not be entitled to say, "Granted that the cases are not parallel, yet surely if it be right to put a man to death for robbery, much more is it right for murder?" A few examples in point will best explain my meaning—will illustrate the importance of the subject, and shew what mischief may be done by fallacies of this description.

Take the following illustration. Paley, in arguing from the beauty, order, and mechanism of creation, in order to prove the existence and wisdom of the Creator, has the following well-known parallel: "If a man walking on a common should find a watch, knowing that it is not a natural production, and that it could not come there of itself, he would conclude that some one had dropped it there; and from an examination of the mechanism, he would infer that some

workman had made it." Thence, by parity of reasoning from the works of creation, Paley concludes the existence, intelligence, and skill of the Creator. Precisely in the same way Lord Brougham, in his Natural Theology, appeals to man's consciousness of design, contrivance, and intelligence in his own works; and thence very naturally, and very justly, infers, from the innumerable and exquisitely beautiful specimens of contrivance in the works of nature, the existence both of wisdom and design in the contriver.

Now, in opposition to this argument of Paley and Brougham, an argument has lately been revived from Hume's Dialogues, which is a wordy mystification of a very simple and beautiful subject; and which, from end to end, is entirely built upon the fallacy we are now considering—namely, the fallacy of rejecting, at once, every argument drawn from a parallel case, because it is not in all respects parallel to the case upon which it is brought to bear.

Hume admits, that from the works of man we may infer the existence and the design of the artist who made them; but he denies, that from the beautiful works of nature, and from their exquisite suitableness to the ends for which they were designed, we can infer the wisdom of the contriver, or even the existence of any contrivance at all. For he declares that the two cases are not parallel in the following respects:—1. Because we understand the nature and structure of the works of man, and we have had experience and knowledge of man himself as the agent; whereas we know little or nothing of the works of God, and have had no experience at all of the Creator. 2. Because man is an artificer who takes matter as he finds it, subject to laws which he had no share in framing, and merely adapts his arrangements and contrivances to existing laws over which he has no controul; whereas, in the works of nature, matter itself, and the laws of matter, are as much involved in the question, as the various arrangements of mechanism by which the manifold works of nature answer each its intended purpose. 3. That the works of man are in no sense "such" works as the works of nature; that they are not at all like them in their number, nature, variety of movements, or mode of operation; that for all these reasons the two cases are not parallel; and that therefore, because we infer a maker and contriver in the one case, it does not at all follow that we have a right to infer the existence of any contriver, or even of any contrivance at all, in the other.

Now this reasoning is a complete example of the wretched fallacy against which we are contending. For, in the first place, it is quite immaterial to the argument, whether we understand the works of nature or not, whether we comprehend or not the manner of their creation, or the mode of their operation; for, whether we understand its structure or not, it is manifest that a curious and complicated machine, exquisitely adapted to a perceived end, could not have come together by chance. It must have been a contrivance, and therefore there must have been a mind that contrived it: and the beauty and suitableness of the contrivance bespeak the power and wisdom of the contriver. So that, in the present case, the points in which it is admitted that the two cases are not parallel, are not essential to the argument, and do not in any way affect the conclusion. But, in the second place, the remaining points in which the two cases are not parallel, so far from weakening the argument, add greatly to its force, and form an *argumentum à fortiori* which it is scarcely possible

to resist. For if it bespeaks an intelligent and contriving mind, merely to take matter and the laws of matter as they exist, and to adapt them to its purposes, so far as they are capable of being adapted; much more does it bespeak a supreme intelligence, first to ordain matter and the laws of matter, and then to put them together in millions of curious and complicated frame-works, wonderful in their order and immensity beyond all that we can conceive, and variety beyond all that we can number. And as to the last objection, that the works of nature are not "such" works as the works of man; is not this also an argument of the same kind? For if the comparatively clumsy works of man, consisting of a few materials awkwardly put together—capable, at most, of two or three different movements, and these only for a very limited time—could not come together of their own accord, but necessarily bespeak an intelligent contriver; much more do the works of creation, so fearfully and wonderfully made, capable of millions and millions of different movements, and capable of moving for ever, or of handing down their movements to successive generations—much more do such works as these bespeak an Almighty mind. Man's works are also limited, as to magnitude, within such narrow and contracted limits, that nature's works often become immensely too large to be under his control, or else far too small even to be the subject of his senses. And yet, within these narrow limits we find proofs of power and a contriving mind. What shall we say, then, of that mind whose works range through every conceivable magnitude, from that of the spheres in their courses, down to the muscles, veins, and arteries of an animalcule, the entire body of which is too small to be seen by the naked eye? The whole argument is as unphilosophical, as it is cold and heartless. Not only does the understanding perceive—the heart feels, that it is absurd; and that the Psalmist was a much better reasoner when he said, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy-work," in the Psalm so beautifully paraphrased by Addison in the well known lines:

"The spacious firmament on high," &c.

The above example will shew the importance of the canon which I have specified. I inclose another paper containing a second illustration, should you think my remarks deserving of the consideration of your readers, who will readily recognize many other striking instances, when their attention has been once directed to the principle.

I am Sir, yours, &c., H. JEFFRIES,
(Archdeacon of Bombay.)

ON THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

YOUR correspondent W. P. S., in your last Number, has devised a very easy method of "proving" the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine; for he has given a large array of texts, prefaced with the remark that "the pride and presumption of man have opposed more hindrances to the study of this (unfulfilled prophecy) than perhaps of any other part of God's word;" followed up by an assertion that "there is a great error which Christians are not duly aware of in interpreting

figuratively what God has so evidently intended to bear a plain and literal signification." Now I cannot submit to argue with a writer who is pleased to set out with assuming, that if I differ from him in my interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, it is in consequence of my "pride and presumption;" while he takes for granted the very question in dispute, telling me, without one syllable of proof, that I commit the "great error" of "interpreting figuratively what God has so evidently intended to bear a plain and literal signification." It has happened to so many clergymen to be replied to in this tone, that the management of institutions for the spiritual welfare of the Jews has come to be pretty well weeded of known dissentients to the doctrine of their future literal restoration; for though that doctrine is embraced by only a fraction, either of the clergy of the Established Church, or of dissenting bodies, it is carried by acclamation at the meetings of these institutions; so that a speaker would not be listened to with much tolerance, who should endeavour to show that he was as anxious as any man for the conversion of the Jews, but on other grounds than those set forth by the advocates for a future terrene restoration. Such "pride and presumption" would be silenced by the most unequivocal expressions of displeasure. Is this Christian or tolerant?

Permit me to assure W. P. S., that those who think Scripture does not warrant the notion of the future literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine, are not guilty of interpreting figuratively what God has evidently intended to bear a plain and literal signification. Isaiah and Jeremiah, whom he quotes, and also nine out of the twelve minor prophets, lived before the great captivity, and a considerable portion of their predictions refer to it; and the restoration from it was the fulfilment of those predictions. We do not interpret figuratively what God "evidently intended to bear a plain and literal signification." We deny that this interpretation is evident. The very question is to determine what is figurative, and what is literal; what is future, and what is fulfilled. How would W. P. S. like me to pronounce that when he makes scores of passages, written before the restoration from the great captivity, to refer, not to the restoration from that captivity, but to a future restoration, he is guilty of the "pride and presumption" of interpreting of events to come, what God "evidently intended" to refer to events long since past. I do not accuse him of either; I only think him mistaken.

I have another remark to make. I would not, any more than W. P. S., interpret figuratively what God evidently intended to be interpreted literally; and I therefore interpret literally a large class of prophecies, which, I believe, were fulfilled at the restoration from Babylon: but it does not follow that there are not other passages which God evidently intended to be construed figuratively, and I am not to be deterred from so construing them, by ungrounded charges of pride and presumption. Does W. P. S. construe all such passages literally? Does he suppose literally that "the lion shall eat straw like the ox;" that "the trees of the field shall clap their hands;" and that several of the particulars in the sixty-ninth chapter of Isaiah, which the venerable Mr. Scott says are "evidently a figurative prediction of the purity and enlargement of the church," were, on the contrary, "evidently intended to bear a plain and literal signification?" Mr. Scott's "evidently" is quite as valid as your correspondent's; and his authority is the more cogent, because he expected a future

restoration; yet even he speaks of some parts being "evidently figurative;" so that the only question is one of degree. Of the large mass of texts quoted by W. P. S., some have been literally fulfilled; and some are "evidently" figurative, whether applying to Jews or Gentiles, to past or future times. It would require a hundred pages to comment on the whole list; but take a specimen. The very first passage referred to is Isaiah xi. 11: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea." Mark the words "the second time." The first deliverance, I suppose it will not be denied, was that from Egypt, under Moses; the second was prospective at the period when Isaiah wrote, and he doubtless referred to it. A deliverance yet to be fulfilled would be the *third*, not the *second*. The next passage referred to is Isaiah xxvii. 12, 13, which, Mr. Scott himself admits, "predicts the restoration of the Jews after the captivity;" and it is only by making that restoration a "typical event," that he can cause it to apply to "the recovery of Israel from their present dispersions." Thus, a real past event is to be made figurative, in order that it may be applied to a future one. Thus, to avoid figurative language in regard to the future, we must turn actual past facts into figures. I might go through the whole list, and shew the looseness of argument with which the passages referred to by W. P. S. are clustered together; but I have said enough to warrant my complaint of the tone which he has assumed. I do not suppose that he really means to argue unfairly, self-sufficiently, or invidiously; but he will, I think, perceive that if I had used his language, and said that God has made the interpretation so evident that nothing but "pride and presumption" prevented his adopting my conclusion, he would have considered my remarks open to such charges.

PAULINUS.

APOLOGIES FOR RELIGIOUS INDOLENCE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IT has occurred to me several times, in applying to persons for active aid in the administration of charitable and religious institutions, to receive such replies as the following: "I have neither leisure nor inclination for all this hurry and bustle; there is a great deal too much now-a-days of running about to committees, and making the duties of religion to depend upon district-visiting, Sunday-school teaching, and other human devices; we have much cry and little wool; under pretence of attending to the souls of our neighbours, we are neglecting our own; we are gadding from place to place with Bibles and tracts, when we ought to be in our closets holding communion with God; my Sabbaths are too precious to be spent in teaching children, and my evenings in working for societies; I find one soul as much as I can take care of; and I wish there were more of the private contemplative graces of the spiritual character to be seen among us."

Now, sir, I fully grant that there is great hazard of substituting

the love of excitement, for true Christian zeal; that activity and social stimulus are not religion; that we may be neglecting to work out our own salvation, while we are diligent in external operations of duty; and that it is much easier to hear sermons or to make speeches, than to practise self-examination, and to be instant in prayer. All this is undenied and undeniable; and it is of essential importance that it should be kept ever in mind; but it is not to be made a pretext for cold, callous selfishness; an apology for indolence, and not being our brother's keeper. Such a reply as the above, was altogether unjust and uncharitable; for who wished the respondent to be bustling or ostentatious, or to neglect his own soul? He was invited to some work of piety or mercy, which required only love, humility, patience, and self-denial; there was no occasion for display; and the prayers of the most spiritually-minded man would not be hindered by caring for the sick and needy; sitting down in a lowly place in a Sunday-school to explain the Scriptures to the babes of Christ's flock; or visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, which we know, upon Apostolic authority, is quite compatible with keeping ourselves unspotted from the world. I can truly say that some of the most heavenly-minded men and women I ever met with, were the most zealous in works of active duty; while I have known others who droned away life in passive quietism, or abused it in self-indulgence, under the pretext that they did not like to expose the bloom of the Christian graces to the rough atmosphere of the world; as if the world were not to be found in the solitary chamber, as much as in a committee room; or as if our blessed Lord was not as spiritually-minded, when doing the will of his Father in the streets of Jerusalem, as when passing the night in prayer on a lonely mountain. His example proves, what experience testifies, that the active virtues of the Christian character are not incompatible with, but spring from, prayer, and holy meditation, and the private exercises of faith, love, and devout aspiration. Idle musing is sometimes mistaken for devotion, and being slothful in business for fervency of spirit. If a man, overwhelmed with occupation, took an extra hour from his worldly affairs, for the duties of his closet, he would prove that he was in earnest; but not so when the only subtraction of time or thought which he allows, is from the portion of leisure which he might usefully spend in actively promoting the welfare of others. I have known such language as I have quoted used by a self-pampering, ease-loving, money-coveting tradesman, who preferred devoting his Sabbath afternoon to his dinner, and dozing after it with his Bible open before him on a sofa, to the unspirituality of attending a Sunday-school. Before his window there passed, in the way to afternoon service, a Sunday-school of boys, conducted by an individual whom I esteemed it a high privilege to call my friend. This good man had for many years been a faithful and confidential agent in the house of which this opulent tradesman was a partner. His salary was £100 per annum; and for it he toiled with the most laborious assiduity through the whole week; and it was only by early rising, and depriving himself of a portion of his needed rest at night, that he could secure time for prayer, reading the Scriptures, and sacred meditation. The Sabbath was an inestimable privilege to him; it was the only day on which he could obtain repose of body or mind; the only day on which he could enjoy family intercourse; or redeem

time, beyond those daily moments, which at the busiest seasons he never neglected, for conversing with them upon the state of their souls, praying with them, and instructing them in the Holy Scriptures. I should add, that being a man of a quiet thoughtful habit, retired even to reserve in his disposition, and of the most prayerful frame of mind which I ever witnessed, a Sabbath spent in his secret chamber, between the hours of public worship, would have been to him a delight, which persons less occupied during the week, or less meditative and devoutly-minded, can ill appreciate. Yet did this good man (who was the very antipode of everything bustling, ostentatious, or officious—whose extreme modesty, humility, and respect for others would have been distressing to witness, but for the sincerity of purpose and strength of principle which prevented their verging to abjectness—whose thoughts were lowly and whose words were few,) find time to be a Bible and Missionary Society collector, a district visitor, and a Sunday-school teacher; and out of his little income there was usually something to spare—a sum small indeed in each particular case, but large in willingness and good example—for works of piety and charity. The boys' Sunday-school, though nominally and as to authority under the clergyman, was efficiently under this respected fellow-labourer. His two eldest daughters (for the mother could not leave her home duties) were much esteemed and loved as teachers in the girls' school; and like their father usually attended the children to church; some of the other teachers (and particularly those who had most leisure on other days) not being willing to resign their own edification and comfort at public worship, by partaking of that self-denying work of charity.

I know not whether it was from some secret twinge of conscience that my opulent neighbour more than once made some such remarks as I have above quoted, while paying me his subscription to the Sunday School. He approved, he said, of Sabbath-schools; he was anxious for the spread of the Gospel and the extension of Christ's kingdom; but his own soul must be his first care; he found work enough there for all his leisure thoughts; his Sabbath afternoon in particular was so precious a season, that he could not sacrifice any portion of it; indeed it was little enough for banishing the worldly-minded cares of the week. Now these cares were none of the heaviest, except as he chose to make them so by an inordinate attachment to gain; and they very rarely prevented his having four or five solid hours daily, from six o'clock till bed-time, for the pleasures of the table and the customary relaxations of the evening; and small fragments of these fallow portions of time would have enabled him to attend many committees, and to have devoted himself to various works of benevolence, without any need of bustle or ostentatious zeal, or any diminution of spirituality, or neglect of the duties of the closet. The bright example of an individual in his own employ disproved all his arguments, shewed the futility of his excuses, and might justly put both him and me to shame. No, sir, this indolent quietism is not religion,—it is sloth and self-indulgence; it is an excuse for neglecting our duty to our neighbour, under pretence of its being incompatible with our duty to God and to ourselves; it is not the plea of those Christians who are most pressed, in a really lawful manner, with worldly business, so much as of those who have little to do; sometimes of ladies of rank and property, who have no care

beyond nursing themselves, and writing long letters about their spiritual feelings; whereas a due proportion of active, and it may be irksome, employment in works of real charity, would be beneficial both to their souls and bodies. There are many more men, in laborious businesses and professions, who steal time for benevolent exertion, than of men unoccupied by such pursuits who do so. It is the heart that is wanting; and in vain does a professed follower of Christ muse upon fifty-seven verses of the fifteenth chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, if he shuts the book when he comes to the fifty-eighth.

G. T.

ON THE TRACT SOCIETY'S CORONATION TRACT.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

PERMIT me to offer a few remarks upon a tract published by the Religious Tract Society upon occasion of the Coronation, and which was widely circulated by many of the clergy in their parishes. I was induced to examine the tract more critically than I should otherwise have done, in consequence of reading a paper in your last Number upon "Sectarian Omissions in Tracts;" and I am convinced that to circulate, from year to year, in a parish, hundreds and thousands of publications in which important Scriptural doctrines are knowingly and systematically suppressed, must eventually produce bad effects. The immediate religious benefit resulting from what is Scriptural may blind us to the ultimate result of keeping back something else which is Scriptural also; but "God is not mocked," and can we therefore wonder that in a parish which has been fed for years by the clergyman and Dissenting ministers almost entirely upon tracts from which all mention of the duty of Infant Baptism and of National Church Establishments is of set purpose omitted, Anabaptism and Voluntaryism should make converts? So far as these tracts go, the people had never been taught better; and may justly argue that if such points had been of much consequence, they would not have been consigned to oblivion.

The chief object of the Coronation tract is to turn this national ceremonial to spiritual account, by leading the reader to think of "the Prince of life and Lord of glory," as a sovereign dying for his traitor subjects, inviting them back to their allegiance, promising them pardon, peace, and eternal life, and of his final coming to judge the rebellious. This "improvement of the subject," though not very strikingly wrought out, is well and seriously intended, and it is always highly important to lead men from things temporal to consider things eternal. So far, therefore, I am grateful to the Society. But among the truths embodied in the Coronation service, there is none more conspicuous than that expressed by Matthew Henry in a remark stealthily suppressed by the Tract Society, that it was our Lord's design that "Christianity should be twisted in with national constitutions." So clearly is this truth conveyed and enforced in that service, that various radical and anti-religious publications—especially a blasphemous Sunday newspaper of wide circulation, called The Dispatch—have been railing against it on this very ground. I do not refer so much to the express oath by which the sovereign binds himself to

maintain the Church of England and Ireland "as by law established," as to the general character of the office, which supposes that Christian kings ought to be nursing fathers, and Christian queens nursing mothers, to the church of the Lord, and that Christian nations ought to provide for the public worship of God. The Religious Tract Society could not of course inculcate these truths; but it might surely be neutral, as it is pledged to be; it might have passed over the subject without making the slightest allusion to it; not indeed that, after all, this is real neutrality; for where warm attachment ought to be inculcated, studious silence is not neutrality; it is only war in disguise. For instance, to circulate millions upon millions, and hundreds of millions of books and tracts, professing to embrace all that the general voice of Protestant Christendom has recognized as Scriptural, and yet to suppress every allusion to the duty of dedicating the children of believers to God in baptism, is not neutrality; it is in effect the same as to endeavour to root out that doctrine from Christendom; it is silently to expel it; for wherever these hundreds of millions of tracts obtain sway, infant baptism is so far consigned to oblivion; and the tracts from other quarters which inculcate it, must seem very bigoted and sectarian, as compared with publications constructed upon this cosmopolitan plan. I am far from meaning that the conductors of this Society, with the exception of the members of one sect, wish this; but of the tendency of such a compact there can be no doubt. It seems strange to me, that Clergymen or Independent ministers can pray in faith to God to bless a confederacy grounded upon this systematic exclusion of what they believe to be a bounden Christian duty; and one not of rare occurrence, but connected with the practical business of domestic life?

But the Society's Coronation tract has not even the merit of being entirely neutral upon the subject of National Church Establishments; but virtually contravenes the spirit of the service, by converting nationality into individuality, and covertly preaching sectarian voluntaryism, and the unlawfulness of national churches, from the very solemnities which were intended to bring out the opposite conclusion. The writer could not openly oppose national churches—the Society's compact does not allow this;—but he does it indirectly. The people of England justly infer from the Coronation office, that the "secular power" ought to be "twisted in," as Henry expresses it, with Christianity; that it is not merely by the efforts of individuals, and of Bible, School, and Tract Societies, in "circulating the Scriptures," setting up schools, scattering "good books," and employing other private "efforts of liberality, and exertions of zeal," that "Messiah's holy reign" is to "diffuse its benefits throughout the world;" but that communities also ought, in their corporate capacity, to acknowledge Christ to be King of kings, and Lord of lords; and that we must not wait for the millennium to inculcate the duty of kings falling down before Him, and nations serving Him. These are obvious inferences from this solemn office; and had any institution connected with the churches of England, Ireland, or Scotland, written a popular tract on the subject of the coronation, such points might have been profitably dilated upon. But how does the Tract Society speak? It says:—

"To advance this kingdom (the kingdom of God) in the hearts and lives of men, and to diffuse its benefits throughout the world, will be the ardent desire and steady aim of all who have participated in the advantages of Messiah's holy

reign. Not that they will employ the sword or spear, *or any secular power*, to compel their fellow-creatures to embrace and profess Christianity; but they will use very different weapons. They will diligently circulate the Holy Scriptures, which make 'wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus,' 2 Tim. iii. 15. They will impart religious knowledge to the ignorant, by their instructions, by the circulation of good books, by the efforts of liberality, and the exertions of zeal. Nor will they withhold their importunate petition, 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven,' Matt. vi. 10. And it is their decided and cheering persuasion, that the day is fast approaching, when the declarations of ancient prophecy shall be fulfilled, when Jesus Christ 'shall have dominion from sea to sea,—and all kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall serve him,' Zech. ix. 9; Psa. lxxii. 11."

Now all this, abstractedly, is very true, and very excellent. We are certainly not to "compel" men "to embrace and profess Christianity" by "the sword, or spear, or any secular power;" and we are to use our best individual exertions in the ways specified in the extract, and also to pray and hope as there exhorted. But what has this to do with the national solemnity of the Coronation service? It is either wholly irrelevant, or it is an invidious comment upon it. The sovereign and the nation recognize the solemn duty of upholding Christianity in their public as well as private capacity; this Dissenters are wont to call trying to make men religious by act of parliament; compelling our fellow-creatures to embrace and profess Christianity; for all National Church Establishments they say necessarily involve compulsion, the compulsion of persecution on the one hand, connected with undue preference on the other: and the influence of "any secular power," if it be but levying a church rate, they affirm, is virtually "employing the sword or spear," and differs only in degree, not principle, from the flames of Smithfield, and the racks of the Inquisition. The Evangelical Dissenters express themselves to this effect, as honestly as radicals and infidels, in many of their own speeches and publications; but when allied with some of their brethren of the Establishment, in the Tract Society, they must be more guarded; the plain straight-forward language of the Eclectic Review and the Patriot must be softened down; it is quite enough to say, in allusion to the Coronation service, that "all who have participated in the advantages of Messiah's reign"—that is, individual Christians in their private capacity, not nationally, even if all the nation should happily be true Christians—will desire to diffuse his kingdom; but that it must be attempted only by circulating bibles and "good books," imparting religious knowledge to the ignorant, and so on, without any reference to an Established Church, or a recognized national ministry, or a legislative provision for public worship; which would be employing, they say, "secular power." This oblique hint is quite sufficient, especially as coupled with the mention of "sword or spear," and compulsion. So also the intimation that we should pray for the time when "NATIONS shall serve" Christ, which will be in the latter-day glory, is a silent reply to the Coronation service, which supposes a nation acknowledging, in that very office, that Christ is to be nationally served *now*. Would that our practice were as good as our public creed in these matters; but the corporate duty is not abrogated, because there are multitudes of individuals who do not acknowledge God in their ways, either personally or socially.

If I have misapprehended the animus of this part of the tract, I should rejoice to be informed what *is* its animus; and what the remarks about non-interference of "the secular power" in religious mat-

ters, have to do in a tract on the Coronation. Some of the very clergymen who distributed this tract largely in their parishes, dwelt strongly in the pulpit upon the Coronation service, as recognizing a religious compact, a twisting in of civil with spiritual obligation, and the duty of kings and people—or what the tract calls "the secular power"—being united to uphold the national worship of God; and yet they were co-operating with the Dissenting minister in circulating a tract which is not even neutral, but which is redolent of voluntaryism. Why did not the church members of the committee see that if the tract could not do justice to the Coronation service, it should confine itself to spiritual "improvement;" for all allusion beyond this—since by the rules of the Society it must, to say the least, be defective—is in effect hostile.

DIDYMUS.

ON MELANCTHON'S VIEWS OF THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.

[We were about to lay aside the following letter, as it forms no part of our plan to occupy our pages with interminable, and too often irritating, discussions upon a controversy which has divided the opinions of wise and good men in all ages, and the full clearing up of which is perhaps reserved for a brighter world. But as the writer says that he does not mean "to argue the disputed point of Election," but only "to examine the accuracy of the reference so often made to Melancthon," we insert his paper, thus limited by his own statement. We must however protest against being swayed by the authority of Luther, Melancthon, or any other uninspired writer; and with regard to our own seventeenth article, it should be tested by Scripture, and if it sustains that infallible ordeal, as we feel assured it does, it is of little moment what was the personal opinion of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Cranmer, or any other individual reformer. One writer alleges "the historical Calvinism of the Church of England;" and another its historical Arminianism; and these questions have their interest and value, but not as deciding what is truth; for our formularies must be taken as we find them, and be tried by the word of God. The objection which we urged to the Ripon question alluded to in the following paper was not that it either vindicates or denies the doctrine of election; but that it makes baptism a test of election, and that it is also an improper question to be asked in examining a candidate for holy orders, since it is abundantly clear that our church never intended her seventeenth article to exclude any man from her pale, for believing the doctrine of particular election, whatever might be the opinion of Melancthon or any other individual.]

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN your number for June, p. 389, I see that one of the questions put by the Bishop of Ripon's Chaplain to Deacons, is: "Does our Church consider all persons who have been rightly baptized, as belonging to the elect people of God;" a question evidently aimed at the doctrine of particular election; and further on it is requested that the candidate illustrate this subject from "the known opinions of those who were principally concerned in drawing up our articles.—What were the opinions of Melancthon?"

Mr. Faber, in his work on Election, has maintained the same doctrine, viz. "that the term elect is never applied to *some* certain members of the visible Christian Church, as contradistinguished from *other*

certain members of the same Church." (p. 305.) And no inconsiderable portion of his work is taken up with attempting to prove that this was the judgment of Melancthon, and therefore probably the real sense of the article of the Church of England.

Having been, Sir, for some years past familiar with the Loci Communes of Melancthon, I have for a long time suspected that Melancthon's opinions have been taken second hand from Dr. Laurence's Bampton Lectures, and that few have fairly read and personally examined the original authorities; (indeed Mr. Faber acknowledges as much;) otherwise it is extraordinary that they should have overlooked the following passage, which is entirely the opposite of what the bishop of Ripon's Chaplain, Mr. Faber, and others, consider to have been Melancthon's opinion.

"Item, Rom. 8. 'Quos elegit, hos et vocavit.' Dulcem salutarem et multiplicem consolationem continet hæc sententia, quæ tamen velut inanis ab otiosis lectoribus præteritur. Prima consolatio est, quod affirmat nusquam esse electos nisi in cœtu vocatorum. Vocati autem sunt soli hi qui audiunt, discunt, ac profitentur Evangelium. Hic visibilis cœtus est Ecclesia, *in qua* semper necesse est *aliquos* esse electos et hæredes vitæ eternæ. Plurimum autem prodest piis scire, *Ecclesiam electorum in hac visibili Ecclesia collocatam esse,* ut sciamus nos omnes ad vocem et ministerium Evangelii alligatos esse, nec alibi electionem aut peculiares revelationes quærendas esse. Commendat igitur nobis hoc dictum curam audiendi et discendi Evangelii, colendi ministerii et amandæ societatis Ecclesiæ, et affirmat in hoc cœtu visibili electos esse."—Loci Comm. Basil. 1558. De Prædestinatione, p. 470.

It is well known that it is a matter of prime importance, in referring to Melancthon's opinion, to state what edition of the Loci Communes we quote from, as the latter are materially altered from the former editions. The editions of the Loci Communes are arranged by Professor Augustus under three periods: 1st. A.D. 1521—1535; 2nd. A.D. 1535—1543, greatly enlarged and altered; 3rd. A.D. 1543—1560, when Melancthon died. These last editions contain very slight alterations. The edition you see I quote from is one of the very last before his death, and certainly contains his last sentiments on this subject.

When a question arises as to the sense of the seventeenth article, not merely Melancthon's sentiment should be referred to, but Luther's; for the late Dr. Burton seems to have pointed out the real source of that article in Luther's preface to the Romans. The whole passage, and it is well worth examining, may be seen in Mr. Short's excellent History of the Church, vol. i. p. 486. And let the reader contrast the Bishop of Ripon's 18th question with the first paragraph of Luther, "Et hac certe stabilis sententia et immota prædestinationis necessitas," &c.

To these venerable authorities let me add one more, not less venerable: "I demand then," saith the Apostle, "hath God rejected his people? No: we must distinguish. There is a visible election of the people which the world seeth, according whereunto of old the Jews, and now all the nations of the world, are elect. But besides this external election, there are, out of the body of these elect, others invisibly and eternally chosen in Christ before the foundations of the world were laid. In him, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, in him all that indeed appertain unto God, were chosen. To him all are given, yea,

given as he to whom they are given, (witnesseth John vi. 39,) with purpose of custody and safety for ever." Hooker, ed. Keble, vol. ii. 750.

Sir, the object of this letter is not to argue the much disputed point of Election, but to examine the accuracy of the reference so often made to Melancthon. In that point of view the question is interesting and important, and by inserting this you will much oblige your constant reader,

DIDYMUS.

ON ELECTION TO BAPTISM AND BAPTISMAL JUSTIFICATION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I understand you to say that Archbishop Laurence's view of the doctrine of election and predestination, as set forth in the Scriptures, and in the seventeenth article of our church, is, that in the case of infants the election is to baptism, and that in the case of adults those were elected who it was foreseen would obey the Gospel. In regard to the former of these particulars, may I request, if any of your readers adopt this opinion that they would mention some text which says, "Elected to Baptism?" I do not ask for reams of subtle argumentation, or of quotations from human writings ancient or modern; but for one single passage of scripture. There has been a great deal too much of reference to this and that human "authority," as it is called; we are safe only when we keep close to holy writ.

May I be permitted to ask a second question, which is, how it came to pass, if the ancient Fathers believed that baptism was the vehicle of justification, that they administered this sacrament only at Easter and Whitsuntide; so that a very large number, both of infants and believing adults, died without receiving it, and consequently unjustified, and therefore not at peace with God? Was the salvation of innumerable souls risked (as by the hypothesis it would be) for an ecclesiastical punctilio about Easter and Whitsuntide?

LACON.

ORIGIN OF THE CREED &c., BEING WRITTEN OVER OUR COMMUNION TABLES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

MIGHT I insert a question put to me by a friend, and to which I confess I could not return answer,—What was the origin, and what the intended signification, of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments being written over the Communion-tables in our churches?

W. P. S.

*** We perhaps misapprehend W. P. S.'s query, as there does not appear to us to be any difficulty requiring solution. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments,—that is, the articles of our belief, the inspired model of our prayers, and the summary of our duties—have always been accounted the elementary instruction of a Christian; and hence our Church mentions them as the early lessons to be impressed by sponsors upon the minds and memories of the children whom they undertake to bring up in the faith of Christ; being taught for that purpose in the mother-tongue. The ancient catechisms contained little

or nothing more than these three brief documents. "The catechumens of old," says Dr. Comber, "were obliged to learn no more than to say those things by heart which they were to repeat at their baptism; that is, the Renunciation, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, as we learn from divers passages of the fathers; and we seldom find more than the creed and the Lord's Prayer as the principal parts of the catechising of the ancients." "As for the ten commandments," adds Comber, "although they are not named in the most ancient writers as parts of the primitive catechism, yet it is not improbable they were taught to young christians also, because the baptized were to promise to live after God's commandments." "I conclude therefore," he says, "that the primitive and ancient catechism did not consist of more than the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten commandments, which are all the ancient parts of ours; only the doctrine of the two sacraments was prudently added in the days of our Fathers, because their catechism is chiefly designed to fit young persons for the holy communion."

It would be easy to corroborate these statements by numerous extracts from the writings of Fathers, and the decrees of Councils; but it is not necessary to dilate on what is so undeniable. These three brief formularies did not however constitute the whole of the instruction for baptism; but rather the text upon which the instructor grounded his more dilated explications of divine truth: as is the case in our own church, which prescribes, that, in addition to committing to memory these three formularies, the sponsor shall call upon the catechumen "to hear sermons," and to learn "all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

The reason for setting up these formularies over the Communion Table is very obvious; that they might be in the sight of the congregation; and the utility of this was peculiarly great when books were scarce; and few persons, especially among the poor, had a copy of Scriptures or the Church services in their possession. The 84th Canon prescribes that "the ten commandments be set up on the east end of every church and chapel, where the people may best see and read the same; and other chosen sentences written upon the walls in places convenient."

INQUIRY RESPECTING DISSENTERS CONFORMING TO THE CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

If you, or any of your numerous readers can inform me how many dissenting ministers have conformed to the Established Church, and been episcopally ordained, within the last seven or ten years, you will confer a great favour upon

A VILLAGE PASTOR.

*** We cannot answer our correspondent's query; nor would the result prove much if we could. There might be many dissenting ministers who would be willing to conform to the Church of England, if they could procure episcopal ordination; or there might be Bishops ready to ordain, and but few suitable candidates. So again, a pious, learned, and respectable dissenting minister might conscientiously cling to his opinions, and be unwilling to forsake a flock by whom he was loved and valued; or to relinquish his ministry for three years; or to admit its invalidity by soliciting episcopal ordination: whereas a restless or ambitious minister; or one who became a preacher from the love of popularity, or in preference to supporting himself by manual labour or keeping a shop; or who

had quarrelled with his congregation; or who could not procure a pulpit, or live by his function; or whose principles were so easy, that he was a dissenting minister only because he had not the means of studying at Oxford or Cambridge, might be eager to obtain ordination in the established communion. We are not speaking of facts, but only showing that the circumstances on either side might be so variously argued, that no certain conclusion could be drawn from mere statistics. Dr. Chalmers mentioned, in one of his lectures on Church Establishments, that in Scotland there is no impediment in the way of dissenting ministers being received, if they wish it, into the national church; their ordination is not objected to; they have only to come over with their flock, and they are accepted in union. But in England, the circumstances are very different; nor do we think our prelates would do well to relax, in the case of a conforming dissenter, those rules which they lay down in other instances; one of which usually is, that the candidate shall have taken a degree at one of our Universities; and he must necessarily produce a testimonial of three years' strict conformity to the doctrines and discipline of our communion. These conditions, though perfectly reasonable, greatly diminish the number of applications, as we can ourselves testify from the many confidential inquiries which we have received from dissenting ministers, touching the necessary requisitions for obtaining episcopal ordination. The number of dissenting laymen who have conformed, would be a more correct test, as there is no impediment in their way; and this number is very large; much larger than it appears to the public; since the transition, whether in individuals or families, is noiseless, and often gradual, though perfectly decisive; and besides being large, it is still more valuable for its character. We will not dwell upon this topic; but certain it is, that the course which modern dissent has taken, has not added to its reputation, either socially or religiously.

GLOUCESTER MUSIC MEETING.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SUNDAY Wakes in the country are horrible things, and the transition from attendance at the church to attendance at the iniquities of the wake (as the Rev. J. Venn has exposed them in his admirable sermon) is violent indeed; but what think you of oratorios being succeeded by grand fancy dress balls? And yet such, I read by advertisement, is to be the case at Gloucester. What then, let me ask, is the impression of the sacred music worth? Is it not gross hypocrisy to run into the excesses of the world under the sacred name of charity? O charity, charity! what deeds are committed in thy hallowed name!

In the present age the subject of attendance at balls has occasioned much discussion and correspondence, and you can perhaps hardly imagine how in provincial districts it is dwelt upon. The London clergy, I am given to understand, uniformly avoid such scenes of dissipation; but in the country there is not the same salutary surveillance kept up by the public. Surely the Bishop of Gloucester will be induced to notice, as he thinks proper, the impropriety of clerical attendance on the grand fancy dress ball, after immediately escaping from the awful and sublime words of the oratorio. How paltry must be the mind that can suffer itself to be thus tossed to and fro; how weak the affection of that heart which can be induced to deny its dear Lord and Master; and how rude the being that can

offer so direct an insult to those feelings which sacred services ought to promote and cherish.

I leave, sir, any further consideration of this foul blot on the religious character of the age to your able censure, and shall be happy to think that I may have usefully directed your attention to this important point.

LAICUS GLOUCESTRIENSIS.

Cheltenham.

*** We fear that our "censure" would not reach the offenders; as the pages of the Christian Observer must be too serious to please the taste of the admirers of "grand fancy dress balls." It is peculiarly lamentable and disgraceful that any clergyman should be found among the culprits; and if he cannot be restrained by principle, he must by ecclesiastical authority and public opinion. Such epithets as "rude" and "paltry" are quite misplaced in describing these practices: they are flagrant moral delinquencies; not the lapse of a Peter in denying his "dear Lord and Master," but indications of a heart deliberately devoted to the world. Sunday wakes, to which our correspondent alludes, were, in their origin, connected with ceremonials purporting to be religious, which is more than can be pretended of fancy balls advertised with sacred music; and as the sinfulness and evils of the former have of late been strongly urged in the neighbourhood from which our correspondent writes, it is peculiarly befitting that those of the latter should not be passed over. The immoralities of the rich will meet with no more favour from those who love their "dear Lord and Master" than those of the poor. We cordially wish success to the clergymen and laymen in Gloucestershire and elsewhere, who are exerting their influence to uphold the sanctity of the holy day and holy things. The Hereford Society for suppressing Sunday wakes, though not much known, is laudably endeavouring to repress a gross breach of the Sabbath, common in many provincial parishes, attended by rioting, drunkenness, and other evil works, and altogether opposed to our Protestant institutions. The Society would do well to collect and publish authentic information as to the number, character, and effects of these Sunday fairs. The friends of the Sabbath assuredly will not rest till such ungodly customs are expelled from the land.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.

(Continued from page 405.)

We affixed this title to a brief article in our Number for June, not being willing that a single month should pass, after the publication of this delightful and instructive work, without some allusion to it, though we had not then space to give any extracts from its contents. We will now quote as largely as our limits will allow; persuaded that not a few of those readers who devoured the volumes as they flitted through book-clubs, will be glad to re-peruse a selection of passages, and to have them for future reference in our pages.

We will not waste much letter-press in critical remarks. The work contains large extracts from Mr. Wilberforce's private letters,

and his secret journals and diary, which he of course never imagined would get into print; and probably if he had suspected that some passages now given to the world, would have been made public, he would have executed his original intention of causing the manuscripts to be destroyed, or at least have expressed very fully his wishes upon the subject. A man of his lively impulses, and who from his youth was accustomed to note down his secret thoughts and feelings, and to pen rapid memoranda of men, manners, and passing events, must of necessity have written many things which it was not desirable to commit to press, especially so soon after his decease. The measure of abstinence which the biographers have prescribed to themselves in this matter, we cannot of course ascertain; and though their communications are far larger than any man would like to contemplate in regard to his own papers, yet we take for granted that they have not catered for the gratification of morbid curiosity, but have kept back whatever they did not conscientiously and filially consider proper to be inserted; endeavouring to judge, not by what their father would have said in his own case, but by what would have been his opinion in the case of another man.

But besides this class of omissions, the extent of which we cannot of course ascertain, so as to offer any opinion as to the degree of discretion exercised, there is often in biographical writing another class of omissions referable rather to the tastes, opinions, or intention of the compiler than to those of the subject of the narrative. We have often seen pencilled, on the materials for a memoir, such monitions as the following: "I would not go much into such a matter;" "There would be no benefit in discussing our friend's views on this subject;" "Be sure you bring out such and such points; they will be useful; and pass lightly over certain other incidents which might be misunderstood or do harm." Should a compiler adopt such suggestions, his narrative may be correct and fair, so far as it goes, and edifying in its moral, but it will not convey to the world a full-length exhibition of character. If there are suppressions, the effect of which is to give too much prominence to some parts of the picture, and to keep others in the shade; if the friendships, the predilections, the opinions, the habitudes of the individual have not been exhibited in due keeping, the fidelity of the portrait is so far injured, though no one trait should be altogether left out.

As to the question whether there is any defect of this due keeping in the volumes before us, the answer is obvious, that unless we had in our hands the whole of the materials from which the biographers compiled their accounts, and found that the narrative was unequally poised, it would be most unjust to conjecture it, even though, in point of fact, some particulars in Mr. Wilberforce's life and writings should be less prominent than many of his friends expected to find them, or others more so. We have certainly here and there observed a remark which seems to indicate that the biographers, highly as they venerate the character, and honour the intentions, of their revered father, do not always enter heartily into some of his opinions and measures. We will illustrate our meaning by a simple example. Mr. Wilberforce was one of the founders and most zealous friends of the Bible Society; the institution and successes of which drew

forth from him many eloquent and glowing testimonies of delight. Now his biographers imply their distaste for this Society, their allusions to it being chiefly an apology for their father's being a member of it. Thus they say, under date of 1809:

"His views in joining the Bible Society have been explained already; and giving others credit for that pure spirit with which he was animated, he saw in its anniversary a 'grand' and pleasing spectacle—'five or six hundred people of all sects and parties, with one heart, and face, and tongue.'"

The passage here referred to occurs six years before.

"Little did it promise, when thus planted as 'the smallest of seeds,' to grow to such a goodly stature amongst the trees of the forest. This is not the place to scrutinize its constitution. The good that it has effected has been great beyond the utmost expectation of its founders, both in the circulation of the word of God, and in awakening the zeal of a careless generation. The evil which has waited on this good, has been incidental in its character, and confined, perhaps almost entirely, to the public meetings. Nor should those who view it in its consequences, forget the different position of its founders. Mr. Wilberforce saw no danger to the Church from the co-operation of Dissenters, who at that time professed an affectionate regard for the national establishment. Bishops Porteus and Barrington, who had supported his efforts for enforcing the King's proclamation, readily joined with him here; and by no other machinery could the result have been obtained. So great was the torpor of the Church, that all more strictly regular exertions had absolutely failed (the Principality had for years vainly begged for Bibles, which the limited funds of the venerable Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, had made it unable to bestow upon them), and they who devised this powerful instrument of good, are hardly to be blamed, though they have with a holy daring called up a spirit too mighty for their absolute control."

We do not pause to comment upon this passage. The writers are not obliged to admire either the constitution or the workings of the Bible Society; and as their title page says that the one was a Fellow, and both we believe were members, of Oriel College, it is likely enough that they heard much, during their academical course, to induce them to think that their father and his friends did not judge well in this and some other matters. But then it is obvious that if all that they can conscientiously concede is, that under the peculiar circumstances of the case, their revered parent, in patronizing the Bible Society, "was hardly to be blamed"—not that he was quite blameless, much less to be warmly eulogized for his sound judgment and enlarged charity; but only that the blame should fall lightly in consideration of his good intentions,—it would require all their candour to give as full, frequent, and glowing an expression of his feelings and sentiments on the subject, as if the topic were one which called forth their own warmest enthusiasm, as it has done that of many of Mr. Wilberforce's friends and admirers. We should ourselves have anticipated that his journal, diary, correspondence, speeches, and conversation, would have afforded a larger relative proportion of remark, connected with this Society, and with a variety of matters germane to its institution, and bearing upon various ecclesiastical and religious discusssions, than we find in these volumes. It may not be so; but when a biographer feels constrained to apologize for the opinions or proceedings of the subject of his memoir, he assumes the character of a reluctant witness; so that, unless he expressly states to the contrary, he may be thought to pass more softly over the matter than his friend would have done.

We might give a second illustration, in a question of doctrine. At the very threshold of these volumes we read as follows:

"A stranger has noticed the rare and pleasing character of piety which marked his twelfth year; and here can be little doubt that the acquaintance with Holy Scripture and the habits of devotion which he then acquired, fostered that baptismal seed which though long dormant was destined to produce at last a golden harvest."

Now, here it is obvious that a fact is mixed up with a hypothesis; the fact is, that Mr. Wilberforce, in his twelfth year, exhibited a "rare and pleasing character of piety;" he was seriously studying holy Scripture, and cherishing "habits of devotion;" the hypothesis is, that this was connected with some "baptismal seed" which had been sown nearly twelve years before, but had continued "long dormant," though "destined to produce at last a golden harvest." Now we are not about, at present, to argue the correctness or incorrectness of this hypothesis, upon which we certainly never heard that Mr. Wilberforce expressed opinions different to those which were held by the writers with whom he was associated, in the planning and early management of our own publication; and we are very far indeed from saying that God may not, if he see fit, re-model the soul of an infant, at the moment of baptism, as he filled John the Baptist with the Holy Ghost, even from the womb; though in proof that he has, in any particular instance, done so, we should expect to see practical effects, rather than ten, or it may be fifty, years dormancy, nay, often a long life of gross wickedness, up to the moment of a death-bed repentance. The question involved in the hypothesis is, whether, if Mr. Wilberforce had lived and also died a profligate, and been lost for ever, there would be any scriptural warrant for saying that because he was baptized, and sacramentally dedicated to God, he had really been once in possession of a renewed, a transformed, "a heavenly" nature, though so it was that it perished without ever giving any visible token of its existence. To avoid this difficulty, Archbishop Usher and other predestinarians confine renovation of nature in baptism to "the elect;" thus making two difficulties to get out of one. But be these things as they may, it is clear that a writer who cannot feel it right to describe a fact without mixing it up with a hypothesis, must exercise some self-denial, to make such a selection of documents as another might think the most suitable. Mr. Abernethy used to say that a patient seldom gives a fact without a hypothesis; he will not say, "My arm hurts me," or "I feel low-spirited or melancholy," (even these very expressions latently convey a medical hypothesis, about the spirits and "black bile,") or "I have a pain in my head or my chest;" but he thinks that he has the rheumatism; or that his disorder is on the nerves, or in the lungs, or the liver; or his head-ache is in consequence of an accident when he was a child; all which notions, said Mr. Abernethy, make the patient, however honest, a biassed narrator of facts. In writing biography, there is similar danger; for it requires either total indifference as to the effect to be produced by a narrative, or a strong determination that the whole shall be told, whatever may be the result, to produce a history, the parts of which are in their exact natural proportions.

But besides the error of reticence, there may be indiscreet disclosure, and this is a charge which has been brought against the present volumes in regard to the religious history of Mr. Wilberforce. To see him so long wavering and inconstant, forming holy resolutions and breaking

them, reproaching himself for waste of time and worldliness of spirit, yet relapsing into the forbidden delinquencies, striving yet vanquished, praying yet falling, is certainly a painful and humbling spectacle, and it has been said may discourage the weak Christian, call forth the contempt of the scoffer at religion, and encourage the hollow-hearted professor, upon the plea, that if even Mr. Wilberforce was inconsistent, consistency is not to be expected in other men. The biographers may reply that if, with their father's papers in their hands, they profess to give his mental history, they must give it as it is; and that to have transcribed his holy resolves without his penitential acknowledgments; to have pourtrayed what the world saw and admired, without duly noticing defects which he alone was conscious of, as it would have rendered the portrait unfaithful, so it would have abridged the instruction to be derived from the narrative. If the struggle was long and arduous, it was sincere; and therefore in the end, through strength imparted from on high, not doubtful. Mr. Wilberforce was so bland and amiable in his own temper, and so much caressed and honoured, that he peculiarly needed to feel his own weakness and waywardness, in order to keep him humble and dependent upon God. Let those who would presume upon his inconsistencies, ponder his self-abasing acknowledgments; and those who would despond, contemplate his final victory. Let both also remember, that in reading the self-condemnatory confessions of a man of keen Christian susceptibility and tender conscience, it is necessary ever to keep in mind, that the sins which call them forth are not what the world would account things of pravity. St. Paul was not a hypocrite because he spoke and acted as a saint, and yet called himself "the chief of sinners." We doubt not that on many occasions, when Mr. Wilberforce reflected upon his words and conduct with anguish and tears, those who were with him were edified by his example. They saw the elevation to which he had attained; whereas he felt only his own deficiencies. The risings of pride or vanity, occasional petulancies of feeling, the love of applause, the levity of temper, the spiritual irresolution, and other sins and infirmities which he so affectingly deplores, were oftentimes checked in their outbreak; so that though the flesh was weak the spirit was strong. A Christian's private diary, if honestly written, must always present discrepancies and anomalies, and it requires much wisdom to decide what is useful for publication, and what had better be omitted, as liable to misconception, or not calculated for general edification. Had the Wilberforce papers fallen into our hands, we should have used the pruning knife more freely than his biographers have done; not, however, with a view to keep back truth, but in order to select the most valuable part of the multifarious matter presented for examination, rejecting dross and trifles. But, taken as a whole, these volumes convey a most interesting and instructive narrative. Those who knew and loved Mr. Wilberforce before, will now know and love him better; and those who knew him not, will find much to learn and much to admire. They will not, indeed, see a character of ideal perfection; they will discover, as we have said, dross as well as gold;—trifles as well as things serious and solid; they may sometimes feel surprised that such a man had so often to

reproach himself for not being duly watchful and resolute, and for being drawn into temptation by worldly habits and society; but they will still discern a manifest progression in the ways of God; the world was being crucified to him, and he to the world; and most edifying and affecting is it to witness how in secret the lamp was trimmed which burned so brightly before mankind. His unseen communings with God; his fastings, prayers, and diligent study of the holy Scriptures; his self-reproaches, his tears, his earnest resolves, his importunate supplications for constant renewals of that Divine strength which was made perfect in his weakness; all prove that the beautiful exhibition of Christian graces, which the world attributed perhaps to spontaneous amiableness of character, and instinctive goodness and refinement of nature, was in truth the result of much striving and vigilance, and was sanctified by faith and prayer. This is encouraging to other Christians. All have not his natural sweetness of character, any more than his wit, his vivacity, his joyousness, his soul-stirring eloquence—the eloquence of the heart poured forth as a lovely song by the well-attuned voice;—but all may follow him as he followed Christ; those who have rugged elements of disposition to subdue may confidently trust to the same Almighty aid which could fortify the more yielding; for the moral of the volume is not to imitate Mr. Wilberforce, but to walk in the same way, to seek the same strength and guidance, and to take warning from his penitently-acknowledged failures.

There is one feature in his character which is peculiarly striking, considering his easiness of temper, and his natural versatility, not to say volatility; we mean his unbending, his persevering, his untiring energy, amidst opposition and obloquy, in prosecuting that great work of national justice and benevolence with which his name is indissolubly associated. But not in reference to the abolition of the slave-trade only do we see this triumph of Christian principle; we discern it in his general course as a statesman and philanthropist; and in the upright tenacity with which he avowed his religious obligations, and pursued his plans, in the face of interruption and reproach. The result was, that God greatly honoured and blessed his labours; the good which he was the instrument of effecting was beyond all human calculation; and whether we regard his speeches, his writings (we allude chiefly to his justly popular and eminently useful work on Practical Christianity), his conversation, or his example, he has left the world a debtor to him to an amount which will never be known on this side of eternity. By the volumes before us, the gift of filial piety, he being dead yet speaks; and in a tone which finds an echo in many hearts. Some who considered him only an amiable visionary, have perhaps been led, from the perusal of these volumes, to see that there was more method in his religious madness than they suspected; and some who esteemed him not for being a disciple of Christ, have been induced to inquire about him as the friend of Mr. Pitt, the courted companion of wits and statesmen, and the idol of the multitude; and to their astonishment have found him upon his knees in his closet, a deeply-abased penitent, crying "God be merciful to me a sinner."

The general narrative of Mr. Wilberforce's life has been repeated in so many forms, that we need give only some desultory

sketches of it; and our own volumes (of which he was the chief projector, and which he honoured as a correspondent and contributor, as well as a constant reader,) have borne such frequent testimony to his invaluable labours as a Christian, a statesman, and a philanthropist, that any detailed estimate of his character were superfluous. It will be more gratifying to our readers, if we select from the work before us a series of passages, without much order or connection, but intended, as a whole, to exhibit him in various points of view, passing from "grave to gay; from lively"—we cannot say to "severe," for severity was not in his character—but to those deeper parts of his interior history which his diary and journals unfold, and which are invaluable relics to his Christian fellow-travellers.

In order to facilitate future recurrence to these volumes, for any particular fact or date, as well as to furnish, in the fewest words, an outline of Mr. Wilberforce's history, and an enumeration of the various objects of piety, charity, and national policy in which he was concerned, we will present to our readers the synoptical view of their contents, chronologically arranged. There is no other way in which such a mass of facts can be condensed into the same space; and the mere mention of the subjects will be sufficient to awaken many interesting and vivid reminiscences.

1759. Born August 24 at Hull; parentage, education.

1768. Transferred on the death of his father to the care of his uncle at Wimbledon; his early acquaintance with Scripture, and habits of devotion.

1771. Removed by his mother from the care of his uncle to Hull; enters into the gaieties and amusements of that town; placed under the care of the Rev. K. Basket; his talents for general society, and skill in singing.

1773. His early abomination of the Slave Trade, and taste for literature.

1776. Entered at St. John's College, Cambridge; exposed to new temptations; picture of his college life by the Rev. T. Gisborne; by himself, and by Lord Clarendon; refuses to subscribe to the Articles of the Church.

1780. Resolves to enter upon public life; canvasses the town of Hull; repairs to London to secure the non-resident freemen; frequents the gallery of the House of Commons; forms an intimacy with Mr. Pitt; his coming of age celebrated; returned for Hull; comes to London; elected a member of the leading clubs; immersed in politics and fashion; gambling transactions; gains at Faro; cured of gambling; his close attention to parliamentary duties.

1781. Makes his first speech in the House of Commons; passion for the beauties of scenery and retirement; residence at Rayrigg, on the Banks of Windermere.

1782. Opposes Lord North's administration; supports the Shelburne ministry on the accession of Mr. Pitt thereto; passes the Easter holidays with Pitt at Bath; takes up his residence at Wimbledon; seconds the Address to the King on opening the session.

1783. Passes his time between London and Wimbledon; consequences of his rare accomplishment in singing, and powers of imitation; cured by Lord Camden of the art of mimicry; his dangers from the temptation of ambition; excursions to Yorkshire and Dorsetshire; field sports; foreign tour with Pitt and Eliot; Rheims; Paris; Fontainbleau; return to England; state of parties.

1784. Great meeting at York against the coalition; dissolution of parliament; forms the project of standing for Yorkshire; suddenly proposed to represent the county; elected for Hull; nominated for the county; elected member; takes his seat for Yorkshire; travels to Nice, accompanied by Isaac Milner.

1785. Returns to England to support Parliamentary Reform; lives in a round of company and amusement; returns to the continent with Isaac Milner; religious discussions with Milner; favourable results; returns to England another man in his inner being; commences a private Journal; begins constant family prayer; opens to his friends the change which had passed upon him; writes to, and calls upon, the Rev. John Newton; studies the Scriptures daily; takes lodgings in the Adelphi to be near pastoral instruc-

tions; withdraws his name from the clubs.

1786. Visits the Unwins at Stock; returns an altered man to his parliamentary duties; proposes his plan for purifying county elections; introduces his Surgical Subjects Bill; gives up his villa at Wimbledon; plans for the improvement of time; intercourse with his family and friends; visit to Bath.

1787. Returns to London; parliamentary duties; speeches on the treaties with France and Portugal, and on Hastings' impeachment; efforts for the reformation of manners, and revival of religion; obtains a Royal Proclamation against vice and immorality; establishes the Society for the Reformation of Manners; travels round the country to insure the success of his plan; retirement at Bath; devotes himself to the Abolition of the Slave Trade; resolves to bring the subject before the House of Commons; returns to London; purposed journey to Paris on Abolition.

1788. Established in Palace Yard for the season; gives notice of a motion on Abolition; dangerous illness; compelled to postpone his motion; journey to Bath; restored to health by a proper use of opium; visit to Cambridge and Westmoreland; return to London; death of his aunt.

1789. New year commences a time-account; serious rules for self-improvement; prepares to move for the Abolition; brings the question before the House; projects a journey to Paris to further the cause; visits Hannah More; visit to Cheddar—assists in the establishment of schools there; birth-day resolutions; visits Buxton; country visits; return to town.

1790. New-year resolutions; moves for a Slave Trade Committee; induces Pitt to found a chaplaincy for New South Wales; is re-elected for Yorkshire; excursion to Buxton; short tour through Wales; visit to the Rev. T. Gisborne; diligent study of Slave Trade question; return to London.

1791. Occupied in preparing Slave evidence; moves the Abolition question; visit to Bath, and to Burton Pynsent; return to London; engaged in the establishment of the Sierra Leone Company; visits to Rothley Temple, and Yoxall Lodge; extensive correspondence; plans and resolutions of improvement; return to London.

1792. Review of the past year; resolutions of greater watchfulness; plan of Abolition operations for the session; proposed appeal to moral sense of the country, and county meetings to petition parliament; proposes his Abolition motion in the House of Commons; visit to Bath; in personal danger from Kimber; returns to London on Sierra Leone business; returns to Bath; French citizenship conferred on him by the Convention; visit to Walmer Castle, and Yoxall Lodge; return to town; takes up his residence with Henry Thornton at Battersea Rise; his position and character at this period; his exertions in and out of parliament to prevent war; attends East Riding meeting for counteraction of French principles.

1793. His first great difference with Pitt; is prevented from speaking against war with France; his mode of life at this time; his motion for Abolition of the Slave Trade lost in the Commons; brings in his Foreign Slave Trade Bill; brings forward his plan of national religious instruction for India; visit to Bath; begins his work on "Practical Christianity;" return to town; fresh exertions for Slave Trade Abolition; visits to Yoxall Lodge and Rothley Temple; occupied on "Practical Christianity."

1794. Frames a plan for a Journal of interior and exterior conduct; parliamentary attendance; supports Bill for Better Observance of Sunday; carries his Foreign Slave Trade Bill through the Commons; visit to Portsmouth; engaged in preparing "Practical Christianity;" visit to Teston, and to Yoxall Lodge; return to town; gives his attention to the state of public affairs; preparation for the session; resolves to move for peace.

1795. Opposes Address on the King's Speech; temporary alienation of Pitt, and displeasure of his friends and constituents; cut by the King at the levee; the country against him; supports Grey's motion for peace; his motion for the Abolition of the Slave Trade rejected by an increased majority; his intercourse with Pitt renewed; resists the additional allowance to the Princes; brings forward a motion for peace; his constituents displeased; established at Battersea Rise; proposed course of reading; tour in Yorkshire; visit to Lord Muncaster; return to town; receives letter from Pitt professing agreement about peace; supports the Treason and Sedition Bills; attends the Yorkshire meeting in support of the Bills; gives notice that he will renew his Abolition motion.

1796. Obtains leave to bring in his Abolition Bill; forms a plan for relief of French emigrant clergy; serious illness; supports Quakers' Relief Bill,

and Curates' Stipends Bill; brings in Slave-Carrying Bill; sets off for Hull; canvasses the county; is re-elected, retires to Buxton; projects an institution for educating and maintaining missionaries; his life at Buxton; called to Hull by his mother's indisposition; projects a general convention for Abolition; inquiries into abuses in Bartholomew Hospital; supports motion for release of La Fayette.

1797. Illness; visit to Bath; return to town; chosen a member of Bank Committee; New-year resolutions; engaged on his book; "Practical Christianity" published; visit to Bath; Good-Friday employment; last interview with Burke; summoned to town by Pitt; new ties; resolves to marry; his motion for the Abolition of the Slave Trade lost; his marriage; resolutions on commencing a new era; carries a Bill through the Commons to enable Romanists to serve in the militia; sudden death of his brother-in-law; visit to Hull; his plan of life; return to town; supports government in the House; engaged in establishing the Church Missionary Society.

1798. Review of the past year; visit to Bath; engaged in correspondence on the newly-acquired West Indian settlements; his feelings at this time towards ministry and opposition; engaged in establishing an Association for the Better Observance of Sunday; again brings forward the Abolition question; gives notice of a motion on Pitt's duel; relinquishes it on finding that Pitt would retire from public life; writes letter on church preferment; settlement at Broomfield; death of his mother; his charities; engaged in establishing the "Christian Observer;" forms a plan for the establishment of schools for religious instruction; visits Bath; exertions on behalf of Jersey Methodists; engaged in promoting the building of chapels of ease; supports Income Tax.

1799. Supports the Irish Union; brings forward his motion for immediate Abolition; supports Henry Thornton's Slave Trade Limitation Bill; serious illness; supports Lord Belgrave's Sunday Newspaper Bill; birth-day reflections; temporary retirement to Bath.

1800. Return to London; approves of the rejection of Buonaparte's offer to treat; supports the Address, and Habeas Corpus Suspension Bill; occupied about scarcity; defeats an attempt to alter Toleration Act; marriage of his sister; entertains hopes of general Abolition; visit to Bognor; alarm for Mrs. Wilberforce; return to town; engaged in attempts to remedy the distress of the lower classes.

1801. Continued exertions for the relief of the poor; his charities; visit to Bath; discusses terms of peace with Addington and Pitt; prevents guarantee of Turkey; supports Addington.

1802. Contemplates a general convention for Abolition; opposes settlement of Trinidad lands by newly imported Negroes; exertions in behalf of Dr. Carmichael Smyth; and to lessen the number of legislative oaths; renews his motion for Abolition; journey to Yorkshire; hasty canvass; visits to Harewood and Copgrove; chosen for the fourth time member for Yorkshire; forms plan for direction of his studies; private devotion; projects an Abolition pamphlet; busy on education plan for children of lower orders; opens debate on Address, and opposes continental alliances; retrospect of the year; secret meditations.

1803. New-year resolutions; visit to Finley in Newgate; busy on Buonaparte's hiring English ships for St. Domingo; engaged in framing Bible Society; visit to Wilderness Park; opposes the renewal of war; censure of ministers, and of tax on the Funds; proposes the volunteer system; attends York meeting; visit to Bath Easton: birth-day review; plans of study; supplications and intercession; providential escape; return to town.

1804. Endeavouring to keep Pitt and Addington in amity; supports Pitt's motion for Naval Inquiry; exertion against Sunday Drilling Bill; carries his Abolition motion through the Commons; supports Pitt's military plan; exertions to suspend Guiana Slave Trade by proclamation; visit to Lyme; summer employments; writes articles for the "Christian Observer," and for Edinburgh Review; preparations for new session; draws up propositions to be proved by African travellers.

1805. New-year reflection; return to town; brings in his Abolition Bill; efforts to suspend Guiana Slave Trade; effectually supports the charges against Lord Melville; supports Catholic Emancipation Bill; mode of life in Palace Yard; occupied on the state of morals in New South Wales; visit to Yoxall Lodge.

1806. Brought to town by Pitt's illness; employed in promoting a subscription to pay Pitt's debts; attends his funeral; his conduct towards new ministry; opposes the admission of Lord Chief Justice into the Cabinet; engaged on Abolition plans; pressure

of county business; defeats Iron Tax; occupied on Woollen Trade Inquiry; draws up the Report; retires to Lyme; engaged in writing an address on Slave Trade; sets off for Yorkshire; writes Address to the Freeholders; canvass; great popularity; returned for fifth time without a contest; Slave Trade pamphlet; engaged on plans for ensuing season.

1807. Publishes his "Letter to the Freeholders of Yorkshire," on the Slave Trade; engaged in carrying Abolition Bill through both Houses; opposes grant for Maynooth College; Abolition Bill passed; congratulations; his feeling on success; embarrassment on change of ministry; decides to try the new ministers; sets off for York; speech at Hull; extraordinary canvass; immense subscription; is returned for the sixth time; address to the freeholders; visit to Brighton; return to Broomfield; attack of illness.

1808. Return to business; opposes Maynooth College grant; supports Roman Catholic Emancipation; active on Smithfield market Committee; supports Curates' Salaries Bill; retires to East Bourne; extensive correspondence; various employments; takes up his residence at Kensington Gore; mode of life at this time; scheme for aiding Spanish patriots.

1809. Engaged on inquiry into conduct of the Duke of York; opposes motion against Lord Castlereagh for seat-selling; attends Bible Society anniversary; supports motion for Parliamentary Reform; retires to East Bourne; birth-day reflections; retires to parsonage near Newport Pagnell; return to town.

1810. Appointed member of Secret Committee on expedition to the Scheldt; supports Lord Wellington's pension; votes against ministry on Walcheren expedition; opposes motion for sending Sir Francis Burdett to the Tower; serious accident; presents Sheffield address; visit to Barham Court; retires to Herstmonceux; draws up list of "Subjects of Action and Deliberation for Abolitionists."

1811. Defends memory of Pitt against an attack of Sir Samuel Romilly; practical rules during the bustle of the session; Report of Committee on Colville's detention in Cold-Bath Fields prison; exertions in behalf of North American Indians; opposes Lord Sidmouth's Protestant Dissenters' Licensing Bill; opposes depreciation of currency; carries an address for rewarding Captain Manby; occupied in watching over Abolition cause; attends installation of Duke of Gloucester at Cambridge; retires to Herstmonceux; correspondence with Mr. Roberts; birth-day reflections; draws up "Reasons for retiring from Yorkshire;" takes the opinion of friends; various exertions for the improvement of the condition of negroes; decision to retire from the representation of Yorkshire; visit to Yoxall Lodge; return home; Christmas holidays, and amusements with his children.

1812. New-year reflections, and resolutions of improvement; busy with Charitable Donation Bill, and Slave Registry Bill; efforts to prevent war with America, promote Christianity in India, and keep back Dissenters; full of plans of public or private charity; his exertions for the welfare of religious societies, and establishment of Indian bishoprics; supports provision for Mr. Perceval's family; opposes Mr. Stuart Wortley's motion for an efficient administration; promotes Association for Relieving Distressed Manufacturers; occupied with negociations for new ministry; visits Sandgate; usual summer occupations; announces his determination to retire from Yorkshire; satisfaction of his friends; regret of his constituents; intended visit to York; vote of thanks; his review of his long and singular connexion with the county; is returned for the *borough* of Bramber; visit to Leicestershire, and to Barham Court; draws up rules of conduct; and plan of life; takes his seat for Bramber; supports subscription for Russian sufferers.

1813. Supports motion for Roman Catholic Emancipation; efforts for Christianizing India; stirs up petitions; illness; East India measure carried; engaged in watching Foreign Slave Trade; visit to Sandgate; stage-coach journey; Christmas with his children.

1814. Exertions for relief and instruction of Lascars in England, and procuring aid for German sufferers; preparations for General Registration Bill, and Convention for Abolition; engaged on Letter to the Emperor Alexander, and on Norway question; censures treaty with France; interview with Emperor Alexander; dissatisfied with government, but avoids direct opposition; carries Address to Prince Regent for Abolition, and amendment to Address on Peace; promotes petitions; introduced to Blucher; writing about Bible Society for Prince Czartoriski; retires to Sandgate; prepares letter to Talleyrand; Brief for Lord Castlereagh; at Sandgate encouraging

adult schools; and adjusting disagreement between friends.

1815. New-year reflections; death of Henry Thornton, and John Bowdler; preparing for Abolition Question; supports Corn Law Bill; his house endangered by the rioters; draws up remonstrance to government on Slave Registry Bill; Sunday's self-examination; resolutions of improvement; opposes motion for treating with Buonaparte; supports Duke of Wellington's reward; takes lead in meeting for relief of German sufferers; introduces his Registry Bill, but consents to delay it; excursion to Devonshire; visit to Brighton; promotes subscription for French Protestants; death of Mrs. Henry Thornton; speech at Brighton Auxiliary Bible Society; return to town; retrospect of the year.

1816. Postpones Registry Bill, on account of Spanish Abolition; opposes ministers on property tax; exertions on behalf of distressed manufacturers; visit to Lowestoft; death of his sister; visit to Bath; projects an appeal to Abolitionists; in correspondence on Foreign Slave Trade.

1817. Correspondence with his children; Sunday employments; anxious to support government; illness; speaks for suppression of lotteries; defends Seditious Meetings Bill; engaged on Secret Committee; supports Habeas Corpus Suspension Bill; writes letter to Emperor Alexander on Abolition compact; visit to Stansted; busy on Haytian correspondence, and in procuring relief for distressed sailors; yearly retrospect.

1818. Engaged on Abolition consultations; avows his abhorrence of the employment of spies and informers; engaged on Education Committee; plans of National Education; draws up Report of Committee on General Boyd's claims; visit to the Lakes; review of life; return to Kensington.

1819. New-year resolutions; renewed Slave Trade exertions; supports Quakers' petition on severity of Penal Code; supports Mackintosh on Capital Punishments; attends numerous annual public meetings; correspondence with his children; moves Address for Suppression of Slave Trade; visits to Barham Court, Blaize Castle, and Malvern; supports Seditious meetings Bill; opposes motion on Owen of Lanark's plan.

1820. Marriage of his eldest son; sick-bed visits; attends religious anniversaries; engaged in proceedings relating to the conduct of Queen Caroline; visit to Weymouth; return to town.

1821. Supports motion for restoring Queen's name to the Liturgy, and attempts an adjustment of the question; supports Roman Catholic Bill; illness; contemplates retirement from public life; his secret thoughts on recovery; passes Easter recess at Bath; moves address on Abolition; parts with his house at Kensington, and settles at Marden Park; meditates a religious and a political work; begins Letter to Members of American Congress, and to Emperor Alexander; death of his eldest daughter; takes retrospect of past life.

1822. Passes the winter at Marden; country employments; finishes letter to Emperor of Russia; returns to parliamentary duties; engaged on negro improvement; supports Parliamentary Reform; postpones Abolition Question; partial retirement; moves Address on Foreign Slave Trade; exertions on behalf of the Waldenses; writes letter to the Pope; visits to Rothley Temple, Yoxall Lodge, Apley, and Cromer Hall; takes retrospect of his college life; return to Marden Park.

1823. Engaged in preparing Abolition Manifesto; writes preface to Witherspoon on Regeneration; takes a house in St. James's Place; his Manifesto published; presents Quakers' Petition against slavery; defends Society for Suppression of Vice; his increasing infirmities; intrusts the cause of Slavery Emancipation to Mr. Fowell Buxton; attends annual religious and charitable societies; removes to Brompton Grove; excursion to Barmouth; visit to Yoxall Lodge.

1824. Return to town; supports Cruelty to Animals Bill; opposes Canning's Emancipation plan; his declining health; supports motion respecting the treatment of Missionary Smith at Demerara, and on South American Independance; his last speech in parliament; speaks at meeting in honour of James Watt; visit to Lord Gambier, and to Bath; passes Christmas in retirement with his family.

1825. Projects Bill for lessening the number of oaths; draws up reasons for retiring from parliament; retires from parliament; his last frank; retires from London; purchases Highwood Hill; visits to Dropmore, Sandgate, Walmer, and Bath; engaged in drawing up his objections to Mechanics' Institutes, and to plan of London University; passes his Christmas at Beckenham.

1826. Engaged on West India inquiries; settles at Highwood.

1827. Progress through Yorkshire; affectionate reception; visit to Wentworth House; return to Highwood; mode of passing his time at Highwood.

1828. Visit to London; engaged in preparations for erecting his chapel on Highwood Hill; marriage of his third son; visit to Dale Park.

1829. Commences the building of his chapel; Mr. Williams's opposition thereto; reasons for building his chapel.

1830. Progress of his chapel delayed; Mr. Williams issues a pamphlet against him; his conduct under falsehood and abuse; Church Commissioners' judgment of Williams; engaged in preparing an answer to Williams; doubts of the powers of the Commissioners; consecration of his chapel thereby delayed; reduction of his income; visit to Battersea Rise; takes the chair at a great meeting of Anti-Slavery Society; his last public meeting in London.

1831. His religious character at this time; leaves his house at Highwood.

1832. Death of his second daughter; retirement to his sons' parsonages in Kent and the Isle of Wight; mode of passing his day; retrospect of life; last visit to Battersea Rise; Mr. Richmond's picture; his feelings at this time on the Slave Trade, and on the principle of compensation.

1833. Last visit to Bath; last illness; his calmness of mind; his conversations; removed to London; his last days; his peaceful death; his funeral.

From this mass of materials the only difficulty is to make a selection. We may pass over many interesting passages which have run the round of newspapers and magazines, and copy some less known.

"His frame from infancy was feeble, his stature small, his eyes weak.....It was one amongst the many expressions of his gratitude in after life, 'that I was not born in less civilized times, when it would have been thought impossible to rear so delicate a child.' But with these bodily infirmities were united a vigorous mind, and a temper eminently affectionate. An unusual thoughtfulness for others marked his youngest childhood: 'I shall never forget,' says a frequent guest at his mother's, 'how he would steal into my sick room, taking off his shoes lest he should disturb me, and with an anxious face looking through my curtains to learn if I was better.' At seven years old he was sent to the grammar school of Hull, of which Joseph Milner was soon afterwards master. 'Even then his elocution was so remarkable,' says the younger Milner (afterwards Dean of Carlisle) at that time his brother's assistant, 'that we used to set him upon a table, and make him read aloud, as an example to the other boys.' Thus he spent two years, going daily from his father's house to school with his 'satchel on his shoulder,' and occasionally visiting his grandfather at Ferriby, a pleasant village seven miles distant, on the Humber. The death of his father in the summer of 1768 transferred him to the care of his uncle William Wilberforce; and after a week's residence at Nottingham, he was sent to live with him at Wimbledon and in St. James's Place. Such was then the standard measure of private education, that the school at which he was soon afterwards placed was of the meanest character."

When he quitted Hull no great pains had been taken to form his religious principles. His mother, he says, "was what I should call an Archbishop Tillotson Christian;" but his aunt was a great admirer of Whitefield's preaching; and under her care he became, in his thirteenth year, "completely a Methodist." His mother, in alarm, brought him back to Hull; where, at the instigation of his friends, he mixed in all the gaieties of the place, and soon forgot his serious impressions.

"'This mode of life was at first distressing to me, but by degrees I acquired a relish for it, and became as thoughtless as the rest. As grandson of one of the principal inhabitants, I was every where invited and caressed: my voice and love of music made me still more acceptable. The religious impressions which I had gained at Wimbledon continued for a considerable time after my return to Hull, but my friends spared no pains to stifle them. I might almost say, that no pious parent ever laboured more to impress a beloved child with sentiments of piety, than they did to give me a taste for the world and its diversions.' The strength of principle they had to overcome was indeed remarkable. When first taken to a play, it was almost, he says, by

force. At length however they succeeded; and the allurements of worldly pleasure led his youth away from all serious thought."

"Already however he gave proofs of an active mind, and one remarkable anticipation of his future course is yet remembered. 'His abomination of the slave trade,' writes a surviving schoolfellow (Dr. Walmsley) 'he evinced when he was not more than fourteen years of age. He boarded in the Master's house, where the boys were kept within bounds. I lived in the village. One day he gave me a letter to put into the post office, addressed to the editor of the York paper, which he told me was in condemnation of the odious traffic in human flesh.' He cultivated also a taste for literature. 'He greatly excelled all the other boys in his compositions, though he seldom began them till the eleventh hour.' For his own amusement he committed English poetry to memory, and he went up to the University 'a very fair scholar.'

"With the self-indulgent habits formed by such a life he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, Oct. 1776, at the age of seventeen years. And here he was at once exposed to new temptations. Left, by the death of his grandfather and uncle, the master of an independent fortune under his mother's sole guardianship, 'I was introduced,' says he, 'on the very first night of my arrival, to as licentious a set of men as can well be conceived. They drank hard, and their conversation was even worse than their lives. I lived amongst them for some time, though I never relished their society, .. often indeed I was horror-struck at their conduct, . . and after the first year, I shook off in great measure my connexion with them.' For the last two years he spent at Cambridge, he was the centre of a higher circle. Amiable, animated, and hospitable, he was a universal favourite. 'There was no one,' says the Rev. T. Gisborne, 'at all like him for powers of entertainment. Always fond of repartee and discussion, he seemed entirely free from conceit and vanity.' He had already commenced the system of frank and simple hospitality, which marked his London life."

"He lived much at this time amongst the Fellows of the college. 'But those,' he says, 'with whom I was intimate, did not act towards me the part of Christians, or even of honest men. Their object seemed to be, to make and keep me idle. If ever I appeared studious, they would say to me, "Why in the world should a man of your fortune trouble himself with fagging?" I was a good classic, and acquitted myself well in the college examinations; but mathematics, which my mind greatly needed, I almost entirely neglected, and was told that I was too clever to require them. Whilst my companions were reading hard and attending lectures, card parties and idle amusements consumed my time. The tutors would often say within my hearing, that "*they* were mere saps, but that I did all by talent." This was poison to a mind constituted like mine.' This life of idleness at college, was only exchanged in vacation time for the ordinary gaieties of Hull, now increased by the presence of the militia, or for journeys in search of pleasure with his mother and sister. It was surely of God's especial goodness that in such a course he was preserved from profligate excess. For though he could say in after-life, that upon the habits thus formed by evil influence and unbounded licence 'he could not look back without unfeigned remorse,' yet he had rather to deplore neglected opportunities of moral and intellectual profit, than vicious practice or abandoned principles.

"'I certainly did not then think and act as I do now,' he declared long afterwards; 'but I was so far from what the world calls licentious, that I was rather complimented on being better than young men in general.'

"Diligently did he strive in after-years to supply the omissions of his youth; but to the end of life he ceased not to deplore a certain want of mental regularity, which he traced to the neglect of early discipline, and he subsequently remonstrated with the tutor to whose charge he had been confided, on the guilt of suffering those, of whom he was in some sort the guardian, to inflict upon themselves so irreparable an injury. That there was even in this time of thoughtlessness a hidden vein of deeper feeling, was shown by his refusing, when unexpectedly required, to declare his assent to the Articles of the church, though the refusal cost him for a time the convenience of an academical degree. Further inquiry removed his hesitation; but he would not, at mature age, when his education was completed, declare his concurrence in religious dogmas which he had not examined."

He now entered on public life; was elected a Member of Parliament for Hull; and frequented the London clubs, where "you chatted, played at cards, or gambled as you pleased." He became intimate, in more select societies,

with most of the rising or eminent statesmen of the age; particularly Mr. Pitt, whom he thus describes.

"He was the wittiest man I ever knew, and what was quite peculiar to himself, had at all times his wit under entire control. Others appeared struck by the unwonted association of brilliant images; but every possible combination of ideas seemed always present to his mind, and he could at once produce whatever he desired. I was one of those who met to spend an evening in memory of Shakespeare, at the Boar's Head, East Cheap. Many professed wits were present; but Pitt was the most amusing of the party, and the readiest and most apt in the required allusions. He entered with the same energy into all our different amusements; we played a good deal at Goostree's, and I well remember the intense earnestness which he displayed when joining in those games of chance. He perceived their increasing fascination, and soon after abandoned them for ever."

Wilberforce formed the same resolution; and his kindness of heart mixed with his self-denial; for upon rising one night, the winner of £600 at the Faro table, he felt so much pain at the inconvenience sustained by some young men who were losers on the occasion, that he became cured of a taste which seemed but too likely to become predominant.

He was present at Mr. Pitt's early displays of oratory, and fully expected to see him, "one day or other, the first man in the country." Pitt used, not unfrequently, to take up his abode under Wilberforce's roof at Wimbledon, and on one occasion spent four months there. The reciprocity was not all on one side; as for example: "Took up my quarters at Pitt's—His maid burnt my letters." The maid's mistake was well matched by some of her master's frolics:

"Pitt's overflowing spirits carried him to the very height of jest. 'We found one morning the fruits of Pitt's earlier rising, in the careful sowing of the garden beds with the fragments of a dress hat, in which Ryder had overnight come down from the opera.'"

The two friends visited the Continent together, in company with Mr. Eliot. The following is a specimen of their adventures. Be it remembered, that all three were members of the British Parliament, and one of them the son of Chatham, and already a distinguished and influential statesman.

"They proceeded straight to Rheims, to gain some knowledge before they went to Paris. Each had trusted to the other to obtain the needful introductions; and when at last the omission was discovered, they had only time to write to Mr. Robert Smith for letters. He had no better resource than to obtain from Peter Thellusson an introduction to the correspondent of his house. With these credentials they arrived at Rheims, then under that episcopal government which had lasted from the time of Clovis, and to which may be traced, according to Guizot, the origin of European civilization. At the time of their arrival the Archbishop (Perigord) was absent, and the ordinary routine of government devolved upon Mons. De Lageard, as secretary to the conseil d'état. Their first adventures are thus related in a letter to Mr. Bankes. 'From Calais we made directly for Rheims, and the day after our arrival dressed ourselves unusually well, and proceeded to the house of a Mons. Coustier, to present, with not a little awe, our only letters of recommendation. It was with some surprise that we found Mons. Coustier behind a counter distributing figs and raisins. I had heard that it was very usual for gentlemen on the continent to practise some handicraft trade or other for their amusement, and therefore for my own part I concluded that his taste was in the fig way, and that he was only playing at grocer for his diversion; and viewing the matter in this light, I could not help admiring the excellence of his imitation; but we soon found that Mons. Coustier was a 'véritable épicier,' and that not a very eminent one. He was very fair and candid however, and acknowledged to us that he was not acquainted with any of the gentry of the place, and therefore could not introduce us to them. We returned to our inn, and after spending nine or ten days without making any great progress in the French language, which could not indeed be expected from us, as we spoke to no human being but each other and our Irish courier, when we began to entertain serious thoughts of

leaving the place in despair, by way of a parting effort we waited on our epicier, and prevailed on him to put on a bag and sword, and carry us to the intendant of the police, whom he supplied with groceries. * This scheme succeeded admirably. The intendant was extremely civil to us, and introduced us to the Archbishop, who gave us two very good and pleasant dinners, and would have had us stay a week with him. (N. B. Archbishops in England are not like Archevêques in France; these last are jolly fellows of about forty years of age, who play at billiards, &c. like other people.)

"'We soon got acquainted with as many of the inhabitants as we could wish, especially an Abbé De Lageard, a fellow of infinite humour, and of such extraordinary humanity, that to prevent our time hanging heavy on our hands he would sometimes make us visits of five or six hours at a stretch. Our last week passed very pleasantly, and for myself I was really very sorry when the day arrived for our setting off for Paris.'"

"The story of their embarassments at Rheims preceded them to Fontainbleau, where, by special invitation, they soon joined the gala festivities of the court, and Mr. Pitt was often rallied by the Queen, who asked whether he had lately heard from his friend the epicier."

The friendship of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Wilberforce continued to the death of the former; clouded indeed occasionally by some political differences; for though Mr. Wilberforce, for the most part, sided with his friend, and in several emergencies rendered him most valuable aid, he was too conscientious to be a partizan, and asserted his right to judge for himself. He thought Mr. Pitt not sufficiently willing to listen to the question of peace with France; he was not satisfied with his conduct respecting the Slave trade and some other questions; and he strongly opposed him in the case of Lord Melville, just as he afterwards opposed his beloved friend Perceval in the case of the Duke of York, justly considering that a public delinquent or wrong-doer ought not to be shielded as a matter of honour by his political colleagues. The Quarterly Reviewer is too sturdy an advocate for "going with your party," not to be extremely wrathful at this conduct of Mr. Wilberforce. If we thought that any argument, however rational, constitutional, or Christian, would change the opinions of the veteran politician, who is alleged to have written the ill-natured and unjust critique on the work before us in that publication, we would urge him to peruse some remarks of Mr. Wilberforce himself, in an admirable review from his pen, of Fox's History of the reign of James II. in the Christian Observer for 1808. Mr. Fox, like the Quarterly Reviewer, was a zealous advocate for the doctrine of "men not measures;" a doctrine acted upon by too many statesmen of every grade, and leading to the practice of voting black white to uphold your party. Mr. Wilberforce considered the maxim immoral and most mischievous, and never would act upon it; and the reasons which led to this conviction he has ably stated in the paper just referred to. (See page 723—727.) We have always endeavoured to keep in mind our valued friend and co-adjutor's suggestions on this subject, and we rejoice that we have done so, notwithstanding the adage, that men do not read newspapers and magazines to discover truth, but to see their friends lauded and their foes abused; and that not to be party-spirited is to fall between two stools, as we confess we have too often found it. But the duty is clear and scriptural nevertheless.

Would that a few political questions had been the only matters in which Mr. Pitt and Mr. Wilberforce were divided in opinion; but unhappily there was no bond between them of religious union; for though Mr. Pitt never professed to disbelieve Divine revelation, he thought and acted as a

mere man of the world, and could not comprehend, or comprehending would not adopt, that pure and holy code of faith and conduct, by which Mr. Wilberforce was actuated. How far, or often, his friend urged Christian topics upon his serious consideration during their long and intimate intercourse, does not fully appear. He is constantly deploring having lost favourable opportunities of religious conversation with his acquaintance; and probably in the case of Mr. Pitt he found such chilling repugnance, that he often waited for golden moments which never arrived. It is clear however that Mr. Pitt was fully cognizant of the strength and integrity of his religious principles, and that he regarded him as a man thoroughly conscientious, though under the influence of some extraordinary opinions. We find Mr. Wilberforce as early as 1785, when his own religious character was still immature, recording one of his conversations with his friend:

"Conversed with Pitt near two hours, and opened myself completely to him. I admitted that as far as I could conform to the world, with a perfect regard to my duty to God, myself, and my fellow-creatures, I was bound to do it; that no inward feelings ought to be taken as demonstrations of the Spirit being in any man (was not this too general? 'witnesseth with our Spirit,' &c.), but only the change of disposition and conduct. He tried to reason me out of my convictions, but soon found himself unable to combat their correctness, if Christianity were true. The fact is, he was so absorbed in politics, that he had never given himself time for due reflection on religion. But amongst other things he declared to me, that Bishop Butler's work raised in his mind more doubts than it had answered."

A correspondence which occurred many years after (1798), on occasion of Mr. Wilberforce's notice of a motion in the House of Commons on the subject of duelling, in consequence of Mr. Pitt's quarrel with Mr. Tierney, will shew the footing upon which they then stood in these matters. Pitt respects his friend's motives; and his friend maintains, in general terms, his principles; but neither seems as if he thought that argument would be of any avail. It might be that this was not the most propitious moment for Mr. Wilberforce to urge more fully what he meant by "the duty of obeying the supreme Being, and cultivating his favour;" but be this as it may, the remark which he makes upon hearing of Pitt's death, shews the pain which he felt upon the subject, and conveys a solemn monition not to neglect present opportunities of usefulness, in expectation of "a more convenient season." He says:

"There is something peculiarly affecting in the time and circumstances of poor Pitt's death. I own I have a thousand times (aye, times without number) wished and hoped that a quiet interval would be afforded him, perhaps in the evening of life, in which he and I might confer freely on the most important of all subjects. But the scene is closed—for ever."

This was a bitter reflection.—But we were about to quote the correspondence above alluded to.

"My dear Wilberforce,—I am not the person to argue with you on a subject in which I am a good deal concerned. I hope too that I am incapable of doubting your kindness to me (however mistaken I may think it) if you let any sentiments of that sort actuate you on the present occasion. I must suppose that some such feeling has inadvertently operated upon you, because whatever may be your general opinion on subjects of this nature, they can have acquired no new tone or additional argument from any thing that has passed in this transaction. You must be supposed to bring this forward in reference to the individual case.

"In doing so, you will be accessary in loading one of the parties with unfair and unmerited obloquy. With respect to the other party, myself, I feel it a real duty to say to you frankly, that your motion is one for my removal. If any step on the subject is proposed in parliament and agreed to, I shall feel from that moment that I can be of more use out of office than in it for in it

according to the feelings I entertain, I could be of none. I state to you, as I think I ought, distinctly and explicitly what I feel. I hope I need not repeat what I always feel personally to yourself.

"Yours ever,
"WILLIAM PITT.

"Downing Street, Wednesday, May 30th, 1798, 11 P. M.

"Strange lengths to which he carries the point of honour. (Diary, May 30.)

"The hope which had led Mr. Wilberforce, in spite of all his personal feeling, to give notice of his motion had now almost deserted him. Instead of being able to carry a strong resolution against the principle of duels, through the general feeling which had been excited by an apprehension for the safety of Mr. Pitt, he found that the fear of censuring the minister would lead many to defend the system in order to screen the man. He began therefore to doubt the wisdom of persevering in his motion. 'June 1st. To town today and yesterday, and back in the evening. Much discussion about duel motion. Saw Pitt and others—all pressed me to give it up. Consulted Grant and Henry Thornton, and at length resolved to give it up, as not more than five or six would support me, and not more than one or two, speak, and I could only have carried it so far, as for preventing ministers fighting duels. June 2nd. Being resolved, I wrote to Pitt to give it up.'

"My dear Pitt,—I scarcely need assure you that I have given the most serious and impartial consideration to the question, whether to persist in bringing forward my intended motion or to relinquish it. My own opinion, as to the propriety of it in itself, remains unaltered. But being also convinced that it would be productive on the whole of more practical harm than practical good, and that it would probably rather impair than advance the credit of that great principle which I wish chiefly to keep in view, (I mean the duty of obeying the Supreme Being, and cultivating His favour,) I have resolved to give it up; and when thus resolved, I cannot hesitate a moment in sending you word of my determination. At the same time I shall be much obliged to you if you will not mention my resolution generally, though you may, where you may think it necessary; but for many reasons I do not wish it to be publicly known till it is heard from myself. The Speaker is the only person of our town friends, to whom I shall open myself at present.

"I am sure, my dear P., that I need not tell you that the idea of my being compelled by duty to do any thing painful or embarrassing to you has hurt me not a little; but I know you too well not to be sure that even you yourself would not wish me to be influenced by this consideration against the dictates of my conscience. I will only hint the pain you have been the occasion of my suffering on the subject itself, which I had intended to bring into discussion. I will only say, that whatever mischiefs may hereafter flow from it, will not be imputable to me. It is my sincere prayer, my dear Pitt, that you may here be the honoured instrument of Providence for your country's good, and for the well-being of the civilized world; and much more that you may at length partake of a more solid and durable happiness and honour than this world can bestow. I am, and I trust I ever shall be,

"Your affectionate and faithful friend,
"W. WILBERFORCE.

"Broomfield, Sat. June 2, 1798.

"Received an answer from Pitt that he was greatly relieved by my relinquishment—he seriously ill.

"Downing Street, Saturday, 6 P.M.

"My dear Wilberforce,—I cannot say to you how much I am relieved by your determination, which I am sincerely convinced is right on your own principles, as much as on those of persons who think differently. Much less can I tell you how sincerely I feel your cordial friendship and kindness on all occasions, as well where we differ as where we agree.

"Ever affectionately yours,
"W. PITT."

We have anticipated, in order to complete our notice of our friend's connection with Mr. Pitt; we now go back to where we left him, during his early years, in London, mixing in the follies of his age and station, and proving that notwithstanding the alleged purity of nature conferred upon him in baptism, he needed a more efficient renovation, a more practical conversion, a more evident translation from the kingdom of Satan to that of God's dear Son, before he could become "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light." We cannot doubt that he felt many misgivings of conscience during this lax period of

his life; and that he often resolved to amend his ways: but these secret strivings of his soul are, to say the least, more obviously referable, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, to the early lessons of his Tillotsonian education, and the still deeper religious impressions which he received in his uncle's family, than to some supposed hidden germ cast upon the waters of baptism in infancy, to be found after many days. He never became vicious in his conduct; we find him in his most thoughtless days conversing with Lord Camden on religion; "persuading Pitt and Pepper to church;" and striving against some of the sins which "so easily beset him." The following sketch completes his chequered portraiture at this period.

"This was the most critical period of this course. He had entered in his earliest manhood upon the dissipated scenes of fashionable life, with a large fortune and most acceptable manners. His ready wit, his conversation continually sparkling with polished raillery and courteous repartee, his chastened liveliness, his generous and kindly feelings, all secured him that hazardous applause with which society rewards its ornaments and victims. His rare accomplishment in singing tended to increase his danger. 'Wilberforce, we must have you again, the prince says he will come at any time to hear you sing,' was the flattery which he received, after his first meeting with the Prince of Wales, in 1782, at the luxurious soirées of Devonshire House.

"He was also an admirable mimic, and until reclaimed by the kind severity of the old Lord Camden, would often set the table in a roar by his perfect imitation of Lord North. His affection for Lord Camden was an intimation at this very time of the higher texture of his mind. Often would he steal away from the merriment and light amusements of the gayer circle, to gather wisdom from the weighty words and chosen anecdotes in which the veteran Chancellor abounded. His affection was warmly returned by Lord Camden, who loved the cheerful earnestness with which he sought for knowledge. 'Lord Camden noticed me particularly,' he said, 'and treated me with great kindness. Amongst other things, he cured me of the dangerous art of mimicry.'

"But if he escaped the seductions of frivolity and fashion, he was in equal danger from the severer temptations of ambition. With talents of the highest order, and eloquence surpassed by few, he entered upon public life possessed of the best personal connexions, in his intimate friendship with Mr. Pitt. Disinterested, generous, lively, fond of society, by which he was equally beloved, and overflowing with affection towards his numerous friends, he was indeed in little danger from the low and mercenary spirit of worldly policy. But ambition has inducements for men of every temper; and how far he was then safe from its fascinations, may be learned from the conduct of his brother 'Independents.' They were a club of about forty members of the House of Commons, most of them opponents of the Coalition Ministry, whose principle of union was a resolution to take neither place, pension, or peerage. Yet in a few years so far had the fierceness of their independence yielded to various temptations, that he and Mr. Bankes alone of all the party retained their early simplicity of station. He himself was the only county member who was not raised to the peerage. He too would no doubt have been entangled in the toils of party, and have failed of those great triumphs he afterwards achieved, but for the entrance into his soul of higher principles. His later journals abound in expressions of thankfulness that he did not at this time enter on official life, and waste his days in the trappings of greatness. Though he was practically thoughtless, ambition had not hardened his heart, or destroyed the simplicity of his tastes."

We shall now advert to that important stage of his life which may in every sense be truly called his "conversion." He had just gained his first intoxicating victory in Yorkshire; having been triumphantly elected member for that magnificent county, as a man of the middle classes, supported upon popular principles against the whole strength of the aristocracy of the district. The sum of £18,670 was spontaneously raised to support his election, of which—such was the zeal of the voters in his favour—one fourth sufficed to pay all the expenses. In the midst

of his popularity "he presented himself at York, as the joy of the races;" and spent his twenty-fifth birth-day "at the top wave and highest flow of those frivolous amusements which had swallowed up so large a portion of his youth." He now determined to make a continental tour; and a friend whom he requested to accompany him having declined the offer, he invited in his stead Isaac Milner, whom he happened to meet with in company, and took a liking to as an instructive and entertaining companion. The narrative of their intercourse, and its results, has been so often told, that, interesting as it is, we need not add much to what has been already related upon it in our own volumes. One or two extracts will suffice:

"In all these scenes he was constantly accompanied by Milner, whose vivacity and sense, joined with rustic and unpolished manners, continually amused his friends.—'Pretty boy, pretty boy,' uttered in the broadest Yorkshire dialect, whilst he stroked familiarly his head, was the mode in which he first addressed the young Prince William of Gloucester. 'Though Milner's religious principles were even now, in theory, much the same as in later life, yet they had at this time little practical effect upon his conduct. He was free from every taint of vice, but not more attentive than others to religion;' (though a clergyman, he never thought of reading prayers during their whole stay at Nice;) 'he appeared in all respects like an ordinary man of the world, mixing like myself in all companies, and joining as readily as others in the prevalent Sunday parties. Indeed, when I engaged him as a companion in my tour, I knew not that he had any deeper principles. The first time I discovered it, was at the public table at Scarborough. The conversation turned on Mr. Stillingfleet; and I spoke of him as a good man, but one who carried things too far.—"Not a bit too far," said Milner; and to this opinion he adhered, when we renewed the conversation in the evening on the sands. This declaration greatly surprised me; and it was agreed that at some future time we would talk the matter over. Had I known at first what his opinions were, it would have decided me against making him the offer; so true is it that a gracious hand leads us in ways that we know not, and blesses us not only without, but even against, our plans and inclinations.' The imperfect recollection which he now retained of what he had seen and felt, when beneath his uncle's roof at Wimbledon, made him the more ready to condemn, as extravagance and methodism, all serious attention to religion; and this tendency had doubtless been increased by his attendance at Mr. Lindsey's meeting, which he frequented, 'not from any preference for his peculiar doctrines, for in this, except on some great festivals, his preaching differed little from that which was then common amongst the London clergy, but because he seemed more earnest and practical than others.' Milner, on the contrary, though deficient in practical religion, knew enough to regard it with reverence in others, and whenever his lively companion treated it with raillery, would seriously combat his objections, adding, 'I am no match for you, Wilberforce, in this running fire, but if you really wish to discuss these subjects seriously, I will gladly enter on them with you.' No great impression could be expected on another from reasonings which so little influenced himself; and their discussions appear to have been merely speculative up to the period of their quitting Nice in the winter of 1784-5. Just before this journey, Mr. Wilberforce took up casually a little volume, (Doddridge's Rise and Progress of Religion,) which Mr. Unwin, Cowper's correspondent, had given to the mother of one amongst his fellow-travellers, and casting his eye over it hastily, asked Milner what was its character.—'It is one of the best books ever written,' was his answer; 'let us take it with us, and read it on our journey.' He easily consented, and they read it carefully together, with thus much effect, that he determined at some future season to examine the Scriptures for himself, and see if things were stated there in the same manner. In this journey he was alone with Milner."

The next year, 1785, he made another visit to the continent with Milner; and their religious inquiries were renewed and extended.

"His discussions with Isaac Milner were continued throughout this journey, until 'by degrees I imbibed his sentiments, though I must confess with shame, that they long remained merely as opinions assented to by my understanding, but not influencing my heart. My interest in them certainly increased, and at length I began to be impressed

with a sense of their importance. Milner, though full of levity on all other subjects, never spoke on this but with the utmost seriousness, and all he said tended to increase my attention to religion.' So interesting were these conversations now become to him, that his fellow-travellers complained of the infrequency of his visits to their carriage. In this state of feeling he arrived at Spa, and spent almost six weeks in that 'curious assemblage from all parts of Europe.' Amongst the rest were many of his English friends; and though on some few points he now controverted their opinions, yet in general he joined freely in their ordinary pleasures, 'Mrs. Crewe,' he says, 'cannot believe that I can think it wrong to go to the play.—Surprised at hearing that halting on the Sunday was my wish, and not my mother's.' Yet though his outward appearance gave little evidence of their existence, deeper feelings were at work beneath. 'Often while in the full enjoyment of all that this world could bestow, my conscience told me that in the true sense of the word, I was not a Christian. I laughed, I sang, I was apparently gay and happy, but the thought would steal across me, 'What madness is all this: to continue easy in a state in which a sudden call out of the world would consign me to everlasting misery, and that, when eternal happiness is within my grasp!' For I had received into my understanding the great truths of the Gospel, and believed that its offers were free and universal; and that God had promised to give his Holy Spirit to them that asked for it. At length such thoughts as these completely occupied my mind, and I began to pray earnestly.' 'Began three or four days ago,' he says, Oct. 25th, 'to get up very early. In the solitude and self-conversation of the morning had thoughts, which I trust will come to something.'—'As soon as I reflected seriously upon these subjects, the deep guilt and black ingratitude of my past life forced itself upon me in the strongest colours, and I condemned myself for having wasted my precious time, and opportunities, and talents.' Thus he returned home; another man in his inner being, yet manifesting outwardly so little of the hidden struggle, 'that it was not,' says one of his companions, 'until many months after our return, that I learned what had been passing in his mind.'"

These impressions, though secret, were never lost. Upon his return home in November,

"As parliament did not meet until the following February, he was much alone, and had leisure to commune with himself. The more he reflected, the deeper became his new impressions. 'It was not so much,' he has said, 'the fear of punishment by which I was affected, as a sense of my great sinfulness in having so long neglected the unspeakable mercies of my God and Saviour; and such was the effect which this thought produced, that for months I was in a state of the deepest depression, from strong convictions of my guilt. Indeed nothing which I have ever read in the accounts of others, exceeded what I then felt.' These were now his habitual feelings; carefully concealed from others, and in some measure no doubt dispelled by company, but reviving in their full force as soon as he retired into himself."

While in this state of mind, he commenced a private journal, with a view, he says, to make himself "humble and watchful." A few extracts from this document will shew the struggles of his mind at this period.

"Nov. 24, 1785. Heard the Bible read two hours—Pascal one hour and a quarter—meditation one hour and a quarter—business the same. If ever I take myself from the immediate consideration of serious things, I entirely lose sight of them; this must be a lesson to me to keep them constantly in view. Pitt called, and commended Butler's Analogy—resolved to write to him, and to discover to him what I am occupied about: this will save me much embarrassment, and I hope give me more command both of my time and conduct.

"25th. Up at six—private devotions half an hour—Pascal three quarters—to town on business. I feel quite giddy and distracted by the tumult, except when in situations of which I am rather ashamed, as in the stage coach; the shame, pride: but a useful lesson. —St. Antholyn's—Mr. Forster's—felt much devotion, and wondered at a man who fell asleep during the Psalms: during the sermon I fell asleep myself. —Walked, and stage-coach, to save the expense of a chaise.

"26th. Went out early—wrote to S. and got his answer, very affectionate and kind, God bless him—refused to go to Camden Place, and to Pitt's; but all religious thoughts go off in London —I hope, by explaining my situation and feelings, to relieve myself from my embarrassment.

"Sunday, 27th. Up at six—devo-

tions half an hour—Pascal three quarters—Butler three quarters—church—read the Bible, too ramblingly, for an hour—heard Butler, but not attentively, two hours—meditated twenty minutes—hope I was more attentive at church than usual, but serious thoughts vanished the moment I went out of it, and very insensible and cold in the evening service—some very strong feelings when I went to bed; God turn them to account, and in any way bring me to himself. I have been thinking I have been doing well by living alone, and reading generally on religious subjects; I must awake to my dangerous state, and never be at rest till I have made my peace with God. My heart is so hard, my blindness so great, that I cannot get a due hatred of sin, though I see I am all corrupt, and blinded to the perception of spiritual things.

"28th. I hope as long as I live to be the better for the meditation of this evening; it was on the sinfulness of my own heart, and its blindness and weakness. True, Lord, I am wretched, and miserable, and blind, and naked. What infinite love, that Christ should die to save such a sinner, and how necessary is it He should save us altogether, that we may appear before God with nothing of our own! God grant I may not deceive myself, in thinking I feel the beginnings of gospel comfort. Began this night constant family prayer, and resolved to have it every morning and evening, and to read a chapter when time.

"Tuesday, 29th. I bless God I enjoyed comfort in prayer this evening. I must keep my own unworthiness ever in view. Pride is my greatest stumbling-block; and there is danger in it in two ways—lest it should make me desist from a Christian life, through fear of the world, my friends, &c.; or if I persevere, lest it should make me vain of so doing. In all disputes on religion, I must be particularly on my guard to distinguish it from a zeal for God and his cause. I must consider and set down the marks whereby they may be known from each other. I will form a plan of my particular duty, praying God to enable me to do it properly, and set it before me as a chart of the country, and map of the road I must travel. Every morning some subject of thought for the hours of walking, lounging, &c. if alone.

"Nov. 30th. Was very fervent in prayer this morning, and thought these warm impressions would never go off. Yet in vain endeavoured in the evening to rouse myself. God grant it may not all prove vain; oh, if it does, how will my punishment be deservedly increased! The only way I find of moving myself, is by thinking of my great transgressions, weakness, blindness, and of God's having promised to supply these defects. But though I firmly believe them, yet I read of future judgment, and think of God's wrath against sinners, with no great emotions. What can so strongly show the stony heart? O God, give me a heart of flesh! Nothing so convinces me of the dreadful state of my own mind, as the possibility, which, if I did not know it from experience, I should believe impossible, of my being ashamed of Christ. Ashamed of the Creator of all things! One who has received infinite pardon and mercy, ashamed of the Dispenser of it, and that in a country where his Name is professed! Oh, what should I have done in persecuting times? (Forgot to set down that when my servants came in the first time to family prayer, I felt ashamed.)

"I thought seriously this evening of going to converse with Mr. Newton—waked in the night—obliged to compel myself to think of God.

"Dec. 2nd. Resolved again about Mr. Newton. It may do good; he will pray for me; his experience may enable him to direct me to new grounds of humiliation, and it is that only which I can perceive God's Spirit employ to any effect. It can do no harm, for that is a scandalous objection which keeps occurring to me, that if ever my sentiments change, I shall be ashamed of having done it: it can only humble me, and, whatever is the right way, if truth be right I ought to be humbled—but sentiments change! Kept debating in that unsettled way to which I have used myself, whether to go to London or not, and then how—wishing to save expense, I hope with a good motive. Went at last in the stage to town—inquired for old Newton; but found he lived too far off for me to see him—lingered till time to go to Mr. Forster's—much struck with the text, 2 Chron. xv. 2—afterwards walked home."

Mr. Wilberforce derived much valuable instruction and advice in the early stages of his religious progress from the Rev. J. Newton, Mr. Thornton, and other devout friends; and at length became himself the centre of a circle of Christians, eminent for piety and zeal, whom he animated and edified by his conversation and example, while he rejoiced to partake of their spiritual gifts. One

or two passages from his Diary, at the close of the year 1785, will shew that his religious principles had gained considerable strength.

"Dec. 20th. More enlarged and sincere in prayer—went to hear Romaine—dined at the Adelphi: both before and afterwards much affected by seriousness. Went to hear Forster, who very good: enabled to join in the prayers with my whole heart, and never so happy in my life, as this whole evening—enlarged in private prayer, and have a good hope towards God. Got up Wednesday morning in the same frame of mind, and filled with peace, and hope, and humility; yet some doubts if all this real, or will be lasting—Newton's church—he has my leave to mention my case to my aunt and Mr. Thornton—not quite so warm, but still a good hope—I trust God is with me; but he must ever keep beside me: for I fall the moment I am left to myself. I staid in town to attend the ordinances, and have been gloriously blest in them.

"23rd. I do not find the use of keeping a diary in this way; I will therefore try how I go on without it. I think it rather makes me satisfied with myself, by leading me to compare the number of hours I spend seriously with those others do; when all depends on doing it to good purpose. Was strengthened in prayer, and trust I shall be able to live more to God, which determined to do—much affected by Doddridge's directions for spending time, and hope to conform to them in some degree: it must be by force at first, for I find I perpetually wander from serious thoughts when I am off my guard.

"24th. Up very early, and passed some hours tolerably, according to my resolutions; but indolence comes upon me. Resolved to practise Doddridge's rules, and prayed to God to enable me. I wish to take the sacrament to-morrow, that it may fix this variable, and affect this senseless heart, which of itself is dead alike to all emotions of terror and gratitude in spiritual things.

"He did not venture to communicate according to his wish: he had learned probably at this time, from Doddridge, to view the eucharist rather as an act of self-dedication than as a means of grace."

We could have spared these editorial interjections of Oxford-tract doctrine. That Mr. Wilberforce did view the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as "an act of self-dedication," is not only "probable," but quite certain; for we find him saying, several years after, in 1789 (he had first communicated upon Good Friday 1786 at Stock, on a visit to Cowper's Unwin), "I am going *to renew the dedication* of myself to Thee, at thy table, O Lord. Be thou made unto me, O Jesus, wisdom and sanctification." But it was not necessary that he should have learned this doctrine from Dr. Doddridge; he had learned it long before, in his Tillotsonian education: and it is a little too much in the Newman and Pusey style, to disparage a scriptural and truly Protestant and Anglican doctrine, by affecting to regard it as a novel device of Zuinglius, or Calvin, or of some Puritan or Nonconformist. Dr. Doddridge is quite scriptural in teaching, that though the Lord's Supper is "a means of grace,"—for no Protestant denies, any more than a Papist, that it is most blessedly, most consolingly, and corroboratingly, "a means of grace;"—yet that it is also, and in the first place, "a sacrament of dedication:" that it does not confer grace in the carnal Bellarmine opus operatum manner contended for by Dr. Pusey and his colleagues, but spiritually: so that if a man does not come with "self-dedication," he has no warrant to come at all. Knowing, as we do, Mr. Wilberforce's opinions on these subjects, we regret that his biographers should interweave their own hypotheses with his history; thus forcing us, as honest reviewers, to add a passing remark; more especially as we are told by the Oriel School, in the memoir of Mr. Froude, that biography is the best vehicle for insinuating their opinions into the minds of men against their will.

Mr. Wilberforce now gave up

his clubs, and many other things which he considered inconsistent with his religious obligations, and injurious to his soul; though still exposed to many spiritual dangers from his large intercourse with the world. In his parliamentary conduct he could no longer "promise Mr. Pitt unqualified support," as a party man, though he had the satisfaction of generally agreeing with him. He also risked offending his constituents by not attending the Yorkshire assemblies and races, of which he had been a warm patron. His mother, who expected to find him eccentric and enthusiastic, discovered only greater kindness and forbearance of temper; so that a friend who shared her forebodings, remarked, "If this is madness, I hope he will bite us all."

"It was now his daily care to instruct his understanding and discipline his heart. Nor was it an easy path upon which he had set out. Though its later stages were gladdened by a settled peace, at this period almost every entry of his Journal records a struggle and a conflict. 'At church, I wander more than ever,' (he says, July 30th, 1786) 'and can scarce keep awake — my thoughts are always straying. Do thou, O God, set my affections on purer pleasures. Christ should be a Christian's delight and glory. I will endeavour by God's help to excite in myself an anxiety and longing for the joys of heaven, and for deliverance from this scene of ingratitude and sin; yet, mistake not impatience under the fatigues of the combat for a lawful and indeed an enjoined earnestness for, and anticipation of, the crown of victory. I say solemnly, in the presence of God this day, that were I to die, I know not what would be my eternal portion. If I live in some degree under the habitual impression of God's presence, yet I cannot, or rather I will not, keep true to him; and every night I have to look back on a day misemployed, or not improved with fervency and diligence. O God! do Thou enable me to live more to Thee, to look to Jesus with a single eye, and by degrees to have the renewed nature implanted in me, and the heart of stone removed.'"

Among his plans of self-government one was to lay down codes of regulations for his daily conduct, including a strict apportionment of his hours to various duties.

"Perceiving that his difficulties arose from carelessness as much as self-indulgence, he sought to counteract it by laying down a set of rules too minutely practical to bear insertion here, while not content with recording against himself every infraction of these severe regulations, he had recourse to another expedient to keep his vigilance awake. —'M. and I made an agreement to pay a guinea forfeit when we broke our rules, and not to tell particulars to each other. I hope this will be an instrument under Divine grace to keep me from excess. When once a settled habit is formed less rigid rules will be necessary.' 'Exceeded, and determined to pay forfeit. —Went on rather better, yet by no means up to the strictness of my plan.' —'I have lately been ill, and by the mercy of God have recovered; yet instead of devoting my renewed strength to him, I am wasting it, particularly by exceeding my rules. I re-resolve, humbly imploring pardon for Christ's sake. Considering my constitution, resolutions, and opinions, how far am I from perfect temperance. This brings on unfitness for communion with God; averseness from him; alienated affections; a body unequal to business; an antinomian and self-righteous spirit, too easily forgiving myself for the past, and looking for comfort to better performances in future. I am hurt and ashamed at myself; yet looking to God for strength, I resolve through him to amend; and, as the only way of being safe, (licitis perimus,) to adhere to my strict rules. May this have an effect on other things.'—'Nothing is to be resisted more than the disposition which we feel when we have been long striving unsuccessfully for any particular grace or against any habitual infirmity, to acquiesce in our low measure of that grace, or in the presence of that infirmity, so as not to feel shame, humiliation, and compunction. We are not to cast off the hope of getting better of the one and attaining to the other. This is the very state in which we are to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. The promise is sure in the end. Therefore though it tarry, wait for it; it will surely come, it will not tarry.' With these resolutions and in this frame of mind he entered upon the year 1789."

The following passage from this new year's entries shews that he

felt, that as there is danger of resting in abstract principles, so as to overlook the details of practice, there is also the contrary danger of a minute attention to precise rules of conduct, rather than to the general motives and springs of action to the heart, out which are the issues of life. He says:—

"My error hitherto has been, I think, endeavouring to amend this and the other failing, instead of striking at the root of the evil. Let me therefore make a spirited effort, not trusting in myself, but in the strength of the Lord God. Let me labour to live a life of faith, and prayer, and humility, and self-denial, and heavenly-mindedness, and sobriety, and diligence. Let me labour this week in particular, and lay down for myself a course of conduct. Yet let not this be mainly on my mind, but the fear and love of my Maker and Redeemer. Oh that the blessed day may come, when in the words of St. Paul, I may assert of myself that 'my conversation is in heaven; that the life I now lead in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me!'"

It was not, however, merely by the secret exercises of devotion, that Mr. Wilberforce endeavoured to evince his gratitude to his Saviour; but also by embarking upon that memorable course of active duty which has connected his honoured memory with so many public and private works of faith and labours of love. Of these the most remarkable was the abolition of the Slave Trade; the general history of which may be learned from the annals of nations, in which the name of Wilberforce stands illustrious in the ranks of Christian philanthropists; but to appreciate his zeal, his laborious diligence, his protracted perseverance, the reproaches which he endured, the personal dangers which he incurred, and above all the motives which actuated him, his faith, his meekness, and his prayers, recourse must be had to the present volumes. The foregoing synopsis exhibits a goodly sample of the items; as well as of his other pious and charitable labours. We select from the number one of his many deeds of private Christian bounty, as being peculiarly interesting, both in its own nature and from its connexion with the kindred energies of his beloved friend Hannah More.

"One day had been already spent, (Aug. 1789) in visiting the place to which Mrs. H. More had now retired from the flattery and bustle of the literary world—'Cowslip Green, a sweet place. Miss More's sister a worthy, pleasant-seeming woman.' This was a friendship which his increasing desire of intercourse with those who feared God led him at this time especially to cultivate. There was no part of Mrs. H. More's character which he regarded with greater admiration than her active usefulness in the retirement of the country. 'I was once,' he said, 'applied to by a Yorkshire clergyman, who desired me to assist him in obtaining a dispensation for non-residence upon his cure. He had been used, he said, to live in London with the first literary circles, and now he was banished into the country far from all intellectual society. I told him that I really could not in conscience use any influence I possessed to help him; and then I mentioned to him the case of Mrs. H. More, who in like manner had lived with Johnson, Garrick, Burke, Sir J. Reynolds, &c. and was so courted by them all, and who had a great taste for such society; and yet had broken away from its attractions, and shut up herself in the country to devote her talents to the instruction of a set of wretched people sunk in heathen darkness, amongst whom she was spending her time and fortune in schools and institutions for their benefit, going in all weathers a considerable distance to watch over them, until at last she had many villages and some thousands of children under her care. This is truly magnificent, the really sublime in character. I delight to think of it, and of the estimation in which the sacrifice she made will be held in another world.' 'There is no class of persons,' he would add, 'whose condition has been more improved within my recollection than that of unmarried women. Formerly there seemed to be nothing useful in which they could be naturally busy, but now they may always find an object in attending to the poor.'

"Thursday, Aug. 20th. 'At Cow slip Green all day. 21st, After breakfast to see Chedder.' Intended to read,

dine, &c. amongst the rocks, but could not get rid of the people; so determined to go back again. The rocks very fine. Had some talk with the people, and gave them something — grateful beyond measure — wretchedly poor and deficient in spiritual help. I hope to amend their state.'—It was this visit to Chidder, thus simply related in Mr. Wilberforce's Diary, which gave rise to Mrs. More's great exertions for her neglected neighbours. The vicar of Chedder at that time was non-resident, and his curate, who lived nine miles off at Wells, visited the parish on Sundays only. The spiritual destitution of such a parish, seen with his own eyes, greatly affected Mr. Wilberforce. The effects which followed from his visit are thus recorded in an unpublished Journal of Mrs Martha More.

"In the month of Aug. 1789, Providence directed Mr. Wilberforce and his sister to spend a few days at Cowslip Green. The cliffs of Chedder are esteemed the greatest curiosity in those parts. We recommended Mr. W. not to quit the country till he had spent a day in surveying these tremendous works of nature. We easily prevailed upon him, and the day was fixed; but after a little reflection he changed his mind, appeared deeply engaged in some particular study, fancied time would scarcely permit, and the whole was given up. The subject at the cliffs was renewed at breakfast; we again extolled their beauties, and urged the pleasure he would receive by going. He was prevailed on and went. I was in the parlour when he returned; with the eagerness of vanity (having recommended the pleasure) I inquired, how he liked the cliffs? He replied, they were very fine, but the poverty and distress of the people was dreadful. This was all that passed. He retired to his apartment and dismissed even his reader. I said to his sister and mine, I feared Mr. W. was not well. The cold chicken and wine put into the carriage for his dinner were returned untouched. Mr. W. appeared at supper, seemingly refreshed with a higher feast than we had sent with him. The servant at his desire was dismissed, when immediately he began: 'Miss Hannah More, something must be done for Chedder.' He then proceeded to a particular account of his day, of the inquiries he had made respecting the poor; there was no resident minister, no manufactory, nor did there appear any dawn of comfort, either temporal or spiritual. The method or possibility of assisting them was discussed till a late hour; it was at length decided in a few words, by Mr. W.'s exclaiming, 'If you will be at the trouble, I will be at the expense.' Something, commonly called an impulse, crossed my heart, that told me it was God's work, and it would do; and though I never have, nor probably shall recover the same emotion, yet it is my business to water it with watchfulness, and to act up to its then dictates. Mr. Wilberforce and his sister left us in a day or two afterwards. We turned many schemes in our head, every possible way; at length those measures were adopted which led to the foundation of the different schools."

The history of these schools furnishes a melancholy chapter in the annals of prejudice and passion. Notwithstanding the disinterested munificence of Mr. Wilberforce, the indefatigable Christian labours of Hannah More and her sisters, and the manifest blessing of God upon the undertaking, these sisters of charity and their friends were aspersed with the most bitter violence. They were Puritans, fanatics, disguised enemies of the church, levellers, and we know not what; just as Mr. Wilberforce and his friends were denounced as revolutionists and disciples of Paine, for plotting the suppression of the Slave Trade; a calumny so fully credited by George III. that he became, and continued, as did all his sons, determined enemies of the abolition. Nothing could be more untrue than that H. More or Mr. Wilberforce wished to encourage dissent. His biographers have explained the only circumstance on which such a misrepresentation could be grafted. He says, writing to Hannah More:—

"Now for the Chedder mission...indeed, I fear with you nothing can be done in the regular way. But these poor people must not, therefore, be suffered to continue in their present lamentable state of darkness. You know you told me they never saw the sun but one day in the year (owing to the steepness of the cliffs,) and even the moon appeared but once a week for an hour or two. The gravitation to Wells was too strong to be resisted. My advice then is, send for a comet—Whiston had

them at command, and John Wesley is not unprovided. Take care, however, that eccentricity is not his only recommendation, and, if possible, see and converse with the man before he is determined on."

"With the Wesley family Mr. Wilberforce had formed a personal acquaintance at the house of Mrs. More.—'I went I think in 1786 to see her, and when I came into the room, Charles Wesley rose from the table, around which a numerous party sat at tea, and coming forwards to me, gave me solemnly his blessing. I was scarcely ever more affected. Such was the effect of his manner and appearance, that it altogether overset me, and I burst into tears, unable to restrain myself.' In recommending one of 'Wesley's comets,' Mr. Wilberforce had no thoughts of encouraging dissent; for John Wesley was no dissenter from the church of England, nor were any of his preachers suffered during his life-time to attempt to administer the sacraments of the church. Had he not considered them as churchmen, Mr. Wilberforce would not have suggested their employment, for in the same year he dissuaded a relation, who complained that in her place of residence she could find no religious instruction in the church, from attending at the meeting-house. 'Its individual benefits,' he wrote in answer to her letter of inquiry, 'are no compensation for the general evils of dissent. The increase of dissenters, which always follows from the institution of unsteepled places of worship, is highly injurious to the interests of religion in the long run.'

"The moral desolation which he found in Chedder, was a striking illustration of his common maxim, that 'the dissenters could do nothing, if it were not for the established church;' for the absence of a resident clergyman had brought the village into a state of universal ignorance."

We have dwelt thus largely upon the first thirty years of Mr. Wilberforce's life, because the history of them was less known than that of his more mature years, and it was highly desirable, as in the kindred case of his friend H. More, that the reader should be apprized of the dangers and temptations which beset his early course, in order the better to estimate and magnify the grace of God in him. During the present century, both those eminent persons have been known to the world, chiefly in their Christian character; and in this respect their names were familiarized, by their writings, their connection with religious institutions, and in the case of Mr. Wilberforce by the public labours of a Christian senator. But it was an almost forgotten tale that the world had once lavished its most intoxicating flatteries upon them; that it had courted them with its most attractive smiles; that they did not suffer affliction with the people of God, because they had no seducing alternative; for that they might have enjoyed the pleasures of sin, under its most attractive and reputable garb, if they had not preferred a higher recompense of reward, than wit, and literature, and eloquence, and all the blandishments of the most refined worldly society, could offer. If any thoughtless persons were inclined to say, that all this strictness of religion was well-enough for country "dowdies" like H. More, or for a good kind of amiable elderly gentleman, like Mr. Wilberforce, but not for those who had access to the enchantments of life; it must have surprised them to learn, that these humble, prayerful, energetic Christians were once the centre of attraction to the most brilliant of gay, and literary, and political circles; and that they did not give to God what men accounted refuse, but what a Burke, or Pitt, or Garrick, or Johnson, down to sparkling Lords and Duchesses, delighted to laud and enjoy. The moral of their history becomes thus more keenly pointed. It is not easy to serve God, even when the world presents nothing beyond its ordinary baits to seduce men from their allegiance; but to serve him when such high bribes, especially as in the case of Mr. Wilberforce, were offered to make

them traitors, shewed the power of Divine grace in their hearts, overcoming the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

We might here leave these volumes; but having watched the growth of the tree, we ought not to omit to cull a specimen of its matured fruits. We may therefore, probably, in another Number string together a few passages from the subsequent portions of the work. We have traced our beloved friend beyond the great turning point in his character; from which time he grew in grace, and in the knowledge of his Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; though even in the earlier stages of his progress, we meet with numerous passages in his private memoranda and letters which exhibit the rudiments of no ordinary Christian character, if deep self-abasement, and earnest desires and striving after holiness, be among those rudiments. We will transcribe, as a specimen, a few passages, from the year 1788 to 1792.

"I am too easily contented with a general impression of religion, and do not labour to perfect faith by habituating myself to act upon a principle of love. I scarcely dare resolve, after so many defeats; but I trust I shall do better, relying entirely for success upon the assistance of that Holy Spirit which we are promised."

"I have so often resolved and broken my resolutions, that I am almost ready to acquiesce in the headlong course which I am following; yet as thus to acquiesce would be to consign myself to irreversible misery, I must still strive to loose myself from this bondage of sin and Satan, calling on the name of the Lord, who alone can make my endeavours effectual. I am this week entering on a scene of great temptation,—a perpetual round of dissipation, and my house overflowing with guests; it is the more necessary for me to live by the faith of the Son of God. Do Thou then, Thou blessed Saviour and Friend of sinners, hear and have mercy on me. Let Thy strength be magnified in my weakness. But whatever be the issue of this residence at Rayrigg, may it be a useful lesson to teach me to form my plans hereafter with greater caution and circumspection, and not to run myself into temptations, from the evil of which he who voluntarily exposes himself to them cannot reasonably expect to be delivered.

"Lock—Scott excellent on St. James v. 7, 8. Much affected with the discourse. Oh blessed be God who hath appointed the sabbath, and interposes these seasons of serious recollection. May they be effectual to their purpose; may my errors be corrected, my desires sanctified, and my whole soul quickened and animated in the Christian course.—The last week has been spent little, if at all, better than the preceding; but I trust God will enable me to turn to Him in righteousness. Write, I beseech Thee, Thy law in my heart, that I may not sin against Thee. I often waste my precious hours for want of having settled beforehand to what studies to betake myself, what books to read. Let me attend to this for the time to come, and may my slave business, and my society business, be duly attended to."

"How should I be humbled by seeing the little progress I have made since 1786! Poor Newton dines with me to-day (new-year's day 1790), on whom I then called. He has not dined from home on new-year's day for thirty years. I shall now form a set of rules, and by God's help adhere to them. My health is very bad, a little thing disorders me; at thirty and a half I am in constitution sixty. 'The night cometh when no man can work.' Oh may Divine grace protect and support me throughout the ensuing campaign, preserve me from the world's mistaken estimate of things, and enable me to be a Christian indeed, and to glorify God by my life and conduct."

"I have been thinking too much of one particular failing, that of self-indulgence, whilst I have too little aimed at general reformation. It is when we desire to love God with all our hearts, and in all things to devote ourselves to his service, that we find our continual need of his help, and such incessant proofs of our own weakness, that we are kept watchful and sober, and may hope by degrees to be renewed in the spirit of our minds. O may I be thus changed from darkness to light! Whatever reason there may be for my keeping open house in Palace Yard, certain it is, that solitude and quiet are favourable to reflection and to sober-mindedness; let me therefore endeavour to secure to myself frequent seasons of uninterrupted converse with God."

"It pleased God to give me this

morning an affecting sense of my own sinfulness, and a determination to live henceforth, by his grace, more to his glory. Cold at first, yet moved afterwards by a sense of heavenly things, and determined to go to the important work of self-examination, and to set about a thorough change. Henceforth I purpose, by God's grace, to employ my faculties and powers more to his glory; to live a godly, diligent, useful, self-denying life. I know my own weakness, and I trust to God alone for strength."

"In pain all to-day. Thought too much of my sufferings, and am not thankful enough to God for all his mercy. My sister and friends kind and tender in the extreme. I find when I am ill that I cannot attend to serious things: this should be a warning to me to work whilst it is day. Oh may I still press forward! Religion is still too much a toil to me, and not enough of a delight. I am shortly going into a scene of great temptation; oh may I be preserved from infection, and so conduct myself as to glorify my Father which is in heaven."

"My eyes will not allow me to write; many tears to-day from mental struggles have injured them. May God, for Christ's sake, cause them not to flow in vain. I fly to Him for pardon, pleading the blood of Jesus. Though I almost despair, yet Christ is mighty to save. I have been looking over letters written to me by Milner, Pitt, &c. when I first entered upon a religious profession. How little have I corresponded to the outset! Yet it is not too late. But I am apt to take comfort after writing thus, as though the business was done. Let me dismiss all vain confidence, and build upon the sure foundation."

OBITUARY.

THE REV. T. T. BIDDULPH, M.A.

The late Rev. Thomas Tregenna Biddulph, the long-known, and highly esteemed incumbent of St. James's, Bristol, was, in many respects, a very remarkable man. His quiet dignity and self-possession, which comported well with his tall commanding figure, and firm, piercing, though benignant eye, indicated a man of decisive character, to whom other men, in any circle of life into which he might be cast, would instinctively attach themselves as a superior: and his remarkable urbanity and unaffected humility converted respect into affection. He was usually the last to give his opinion; he would often sit and listen in silent modesty and attention, while younger and less able men were uttering their sentiments; till by spontaneous acclamation all appealed to him, wondering how it was that they had allowed him so long to continue "a hearer only;" and charmed by the simplicity, the judiciousness, the fervour, the manly dignity, and the Christian love and zeal, with which, in few words, he poured forth the dictates of matured wisdom and piety. During the last thirty or forty years he was the centre of influence of a large body of his attached brethren, who delighted to listen to his counsels, and to imitate his example, following him as he followed Christ; and to him, in an especial manner, Bristol has been indebted, under God, for that scriptural soundness of doctrine, that firm attachment to the Church of England, and those innumerable works of piety and charity, which have for many years rendered that ancient city as illustrious in the annals of religion as of commerce. By his publications and large correspondence, he exercised an extensive and well-directed influence, far beyond the limits of his own immediate sphere of personal labour; but it was in Bristol and its vicinity that the full weight of his character was felt; and to it may, in a great measure, be attributed that spirit of union and brotherly love which have so signally marked the operations of Christian zeal and philanthropy in that highly-favoured city. Mr. Biddulph was in Bristol what his beloved friend Mr. Simeon was in Cambridge; or what some of the Fathers and Reformers were in their respective neighbourhoods; and in a conscientious and disinterested administration of patronage, he would have been long ago appointed Bishop of a diocese which he had so greatly adorned and blessed by his labours as a Presbyter.

We are not aware whether his family intend to draw up a memoir of him, accompanied by suitable selections from his correspondence, which would be

highly valuable and interesting, as he held epistolary intercourse with not a few of the best and most eminent men, whose names have been dear to the friends of religion during the last half century: many of whose letters would be found among his papers. We are surprised that only one sermon —the Rev. J. East's—has been published of the many which were preached upon occasion of his death; but in the absence of an ample and authentic narrative, we will present a few cursory particulars, gleaned from such sources as are within reach.

The Rev. T. T. Biddulph was the only son of the Rev. Thomas Biddulph, Vicar of Padstow, in Cornwall. He was born July 5, 1763, in the parish of Claines, in Worcestershire, where his father had gone for the benefit of his health. Little is known of his early education. At the proper age he went to Queen's College, Oxford, where he proceeded in due time to the degrees of B.A. and M.A. One remarkable incident has been mentioned in connection with his college life, of a peculiarly afflictive description—the death of two young men, who were drowned while bathing in company with him and another friend. This event is said to have produced in his mind very deep religious impressions, the effect of which was manifest in his future life.

He was admitted to Deacon's orders, in 1785, nearly a year before the usual time, by the Bishop of Exeter, to the curacy of Padstow, and was ordained priest by the Bishop of Salisbury, in May, 1788; so that the term of his ministry as a presbyter was exactly half a century. He successively laboured at Ditchett and Wansbrough, in Somersetshire; at Bengeworth, in Worcestershire; and at Congresbury, near Bristol.

In February, 1789, he was married to Miss Rachel Shrapnell, daughter of Z. Shrapnell, Esq., of Bradford, Wilts, by whom he had 14 children, 10 of whom he survived. Soon after his marriage he removed to Bristol, and became assistant to the Rev. W. Tandy, at that time curate of St. Mary-le-Port, with whom he shared not only the ministry of the cross, but the reproach of the cross also—for whilst an eminent blessing attended the preaching of the Gospel by those two faithful servants of Christ, such was the obloquy excited by a simple enunciation of the doctrines contained in the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England, that even some piously-disposed persons were unwilling to be seen entering the church where these stigmatized principles were inculcated, and specific cases are recollected of respectable parties quitting their carriage at the distance of a street, that they might steal unobserved into the proscribed resort of reputed fanaticism.

In the year 1796, the Sunday evening lecture of St. Werburgh's was established, and Mr. Biddulph was appointed the first lecturer. This is said to have been the first evening service opened in any of the churches in Bristol. Mr. Fisher Weare of Ashton, being desirous of establishing him in Bristol, purchased the presentation of the living of Congresbury, with the express object of effecting an exchange when any opening might occur in this city. Dr. Small having obtained the erection of a new church in his parish, now called St. Paul's, procured its separation from St. James's; and an arrangement was made whereby Mr. Biddulph was nominated to the incumbency of St. James's, to which he was instituted 21st Sept. 1799. He preached his first sermon on Acts xxiv. 14—"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets." This sermon, which contained a clear and faithful exposition of Scriptural and Anglican doctrine, he published, dedicating it to the vestry and inhabitants of the parish. Here he laboured for upwards of 38 years, a blessing to all around him. He was a laborious parish minister, continually devising means of extending his usefulness in every direction. He was a most attached member of the Church of England, and on several occasions stood forward as a defender of its doctrines and discipline. His Essays on the Liturgy and the Collects are well known and justly esteemed. Many excellent tracts from his pen were printed by the Church of England Tract Society, and were afterwards collected by himself into a small pamphlet, which he entitled Ecclesiastica.

In the year 1798 he united with some other clergymen in setting on foot a small theological miscellany, entitled Zion's Trumpet, the name of which was afterwards changed to that of the Christian Guardian. This useful publication was removed to London in the year 1809, and has been continued ever since, with firm adherence to its original principles. He published a sermon, entitled the British Jubilee, on the commencement of the 50th year of the reign of George the 3rd, and four other sermons, on the funeral days of the Princess Charlotte of Wales, Queen Charlotte, George the 3rd, and the Duke of York. He also published a

missionary sermon entitled, "Christian Charity exerting itself by means of Missionary excitement for the correction of Hindoo Idolatry." It was during seasons of illness and withdrawal from public labours, that he wrote several of his publications, such as "Divine Influence, or the operation of the Holy Spirit, traced from the creation of man to the consummation of all things;" and his "Lectures on the Fifty-first Psalm." He defended the doctrines which he preached, in his "Charge of Non-conformity repelled;" his remarks on the tracts of Dr. Mant; his "Search after Truth, on the subject of some novel opinions in Theology;" his "Evangelical Preaching defended;" his "Conversion; not miracle, the standing test of Divine influence in the Christian Church;" and his "Dialogues on Baptismal Regeneration." This last work he recently republished, with alterations and additions, with especial reference to the errors inculcated in the Oxford Tracts.

The last sermon which he published was preached at the primary visitation of the Archdeacon of Bristol, and was entitled "The Septuagenarian Confession of Faith." The doctrine of justification by faith he found to be, according to the language of the 11th Article of the Church of England, "most wholesome and very full of comfort." It was the subject of his last discourse at St. Stephen's church, on Friday morning, April 27th, when he preached on Isaiah xlii. 21; and was very much dwelt upon in his last sermon at St. James's, on the following Sunday morning, on Galatians v. 6. On the evening of that day he was seized with a cold shivering, and obliged to retire at once to bed; but by means of the remedies used he was able to rise again on Tuesday, and on Wednesday come down again into his parlour; but on Wednesday evening the fever returned, and he was confined afterwards until he quietly fell asleep in Jesus, on Saturday afternoon, May 19th, 1838.

Mr. Biddulph's malady was of so distressing a kind, as to deprive him of the power of lengthened converse, or of the fixed exercise of thought; but there were intervals of recollection and self-possession, and those intervals served to demonstrate that he enjoyed the presence of his Saviour. There was nothing of extacy or transport, but there was that which is perhaps more desirable—peace, —peace undisturbed by doubt or fear. His own expression was, "I am in great peace." We remember hearing him say, nearly thirty years ago; "Peace, not daily triumph, was promised by our Lord to his followers; he may give the Christian warrior triumph as special bounty, but his ordinary pay is peace." A text on which his mind dwelt, and to which he clung, was that saying of the Saviour, "Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." His renunciation of self-dependence was entire. "Grace reigns" (he exclaimed on one occasion),—"that is my word—grace reigns!" One who watched by his bed added, "through righteousness." "Yes," he replied, "but not *my* righteousness," (lifting up both his hands, and expanding them suddenly, as if casting something from him), "I nauseate it!" In the same strain, he said to a medical friend, "I have often dwelt upon the words of the Apostle, 'though I be nothing,' but I never felt their full meaning till now—I am indeed 'nothing'—I feel annihilated."

On Friday, the 18th, the last day but one of his mortal existence, he said, "Do tell me something of him who came to save sinners:" A near relative read to him Heb. iv. 14—16, "Seeing, then, that we have a great High Priest," &c. "let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need;" to which he added his fervent "Amen." He suffered exceedingly from thirst; on water being given him, he quoted the words, "To him that is athirst will I give to drink the water of life freely." The last day (Saturday) was freer from pain, but passed in a state of *coma*, and at five o'clock, p.m., he entered into rest.

The funeral was attended by more than seventy clergymen of Bristol and its neighbourhood, attired in their gowns, and wearing hatbands and scarfs; and by a large procession of laymen; accompanied by dense multitudes of the inhabitants. Some of the clerical witnesses of this affecting scene were probably reminded of the funeral honours of Mr. Simeon at Cambridge; both instances strikingly shewing that "patient continuance in well doing;" will usually, in time, "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men;" and though such posthumous tributes of respect are not in themselves of any importance, yet as God has promised that "them that honour me I will honour," he sometimes, even in the present world, makes the very scene of the persecutions of his servants to be—we will not say the arena of their triumphs, but the witness to the success of their labours for Christ's sake.

As our testimony respecting the character and labours of our beloved and revered friend, might not be so satisfac-

tory as the attestation of ear and eye witnesses on the spot, we gladly extract the following just and eloquent remarks from the "Bristol Journal;" to which we will add a passage from the sermon of Mr. East, who was during six years his curate:

"To one who has only contemplated the latter portion of Mr. Biddulph's career—ministering as he has been to a devout and attentive audience, gathered around him from all quarters of the city—his preaching listened to with avidity, by many of the more refined and polished of society, whilst a numerous body of clergy, sedulously employed in inculcating the same Divine truths, have looked to him for advice and counsel, and venerated him as their best earthly exemplar—whilst, too, the prelates who for the last twenty years have successively filled the see, have seemed to vie each with his predecessor in the kindest expressions of their confidence and esteem to one so worthy of them—to an observer who has only witnessed these halcyon days of Mr. Biddulph's ministry, it might seem almost incredible that only thirty years ago, the same truths, uttered by the same lips, did but render the promulgator of them a bye-word amongst the people. But the like thing has happened to a Milner at Hull, to a Simeon at Cambridge, and to many other faithful servants of Christ, who by patient continuance in well-doing have lived down opposition, and stopped the mouths of gainsayers. And it should encourage the Christian, and especially the Christian minister, to go on steadily and perseveringly in his work, even when assailed with unmerited reproach—not being afraid of the fear of man, but 'in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if peradventure God will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth.'

"From this general view of Mr. Biddulph's course, we may now turn to the consideration of some particular traits which will serve to fill up the outline, and place his character in bolder relief.

"Mr. Biddulph was a most attached member of the Church of England. He held very high views of the apostolic character of the Church and its ministry. He employed his pen most successfully in the elucidation of her formularies, and was ever found in the foremost rank of her defenders. The peroration of his sermon preached at the primary visitation of the Archdeacon of Bristol, contains a most animated passage, the reiterated burden of which is, 'I LOVE MY CHURCH.' It was, and it was felt to be, the *cygnea vox*, the last testimony of a true lover of our venerable establishment, and those who were privileged to hear him can bear witness with what fervency it was uttered. Mr. Biddulph's principles and conduct, as a firm member of the Church, afford a striking refutation of the calumny once extensively prevalent, but which the recent current of events has tended pretty effectually to wipe away—that Evangelical preachers are necessarily low Churchmen, or, in other words, that those who preach according to the letter of the Church's Articles and Homilies, must needs be disaffected to her constitution and discipline!

"Closely allied in Mr. Biddulph's character with his attachment to the Church, were those inseparable concomitants of true Churchmanship, *loyalty and Patriotism*.

"He regarded Popery as the Upas, under whose pestilential droppings the fair fields of Ireland are withering—and he laboured, by means of scriptural instruction, and the dissemination of the word of God, to uproot the poison-tree, and plant in its place that tree of life 'whose leaves are for the healing of the nations.' Nor did he restrict his support to those efforts for the maintenance of Protestantism, which are merely defensive. He knew well that it was by employing the sword of the Spirit in direct attacks upon the strong holds of Popery, that Luther and his compeers became the instruments of emancipating whole regions from its thraldom; he therefore inferred that God's blessing may be looked for on similar means in the present day, and that it is the duty of Churchmen not only to defend truth but to expose error. On this principle he not only supported the Reformation Society, which is in its character strictly theological, but it was one of the last acts of his life to have his name enrolled on the lists of the newly-formed Protestant Association — thus in a most marked manner recording his final protest against Popery.

"As a preacher, he has throughout the whole course of his ministry been very effective. His style of preaching was peculiarly impressive; but it owed its power, not to any laboured rhetorical arts, but to soundness of doctrine, perspicuity of thought, felicity of illustration, and gravity of diction; above all, to that spiritual savour which ran through the whole, and which may be best described in the language of the Apostle, 'his speech and his preaching were not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power.'

"The most honourable testimony

that can be supplied, in regard to the efficiency of Mr. B.'s preaching, is to be found in its actual results. The known instances of spiritual benefit derived by his hearers are very numerous; and not a few who are, or have been, useful and even eminent preachers of the Gospel in the Church of England, have owed their first impressions, under God, to his ministry.

"It has been a common occurrence with him to be applied to for counsel by young men under serious impressions, wishing to enter the ministry, with the declared single object of labouring to promote the glory of God and the salvation of men. In such cases, when in the exercise of a sound discretion Mr. B. considered that the applicants were sincere and single-eyed in their professions, he encouraged them with his counsel and influence; and when a defect of pecuniary resources was the sole bar to the progress of the candidate for the holy office, he was often enabled by the help of friends, to remove that impediment. Perhaps not fewer than a hundred clergymen have entered the Church under his auspices, many of whom are at this time faithfully dispensing the word of life in different parts of the kingdom.

"As a writer, too, Mr. B. has rendered great service to the cause of vital religion, as well as to the Established Church. His object in this, as in every department of his labours, was to serve his Divine Master, and not to rear a monument to his own fame. His writings have been for the most part either doctrinal and practical, or else of a polemical nature, and drawn forth by the theological controversies which incidentally arose.

"His connexion with, and influence over, the religious and benevolent Institutions of Bristol was most extensive. Of several most valuable institutions he was either the originator or one of the earliest promoters; among these may be mentioned the Church of England Tract Society, an institution which has been sanctioned by successive bishops, and whose publications are characterized by such soundness of doctrine, sobriety of style, and genuine Church of England principle, as entitle them to the warm support of the friends of the Establishment. But it would occupy far too much space to attempt even an enumeration of the religious and benevolent Societies and Institutions in which he took an active part."

It is not necessary for us to supply this omission; we will only mention, that among the institutions most dear to him, were the Church Missionary Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Bristol Clerical Education Society.

To the above testimony we will add the following passage from the interesting and warm-hearted discourse of his amiable and devout friend and fellow-labourer, the Rev. J. East.

"Mr. Biddulph closely resembled St. Paul in the subject matter of his ministry. He was a man of no mean pretensions to the name of a learned, though he might not be deemed an eloquent man. His reading was extensive; his taste intellectual, philosophical, and elegant; his diction pure and elevated; his illustrations of truth happy, vivid, and often strikingly original. But the grand and commanding feature of his ministry was, that it embodied and set forth, in all its fair and just and full proportions, the truth—the truth of God—'the truth as it is in Jesus.' Like his great human exemplar, he knew 'nothing among men, save Jesus Christ and him crucified:'—no doctrine, *no* article of faith, no moral rule of life but what centered in, but what radiated from, the cross of Christ. His sermon preached last year before the Venerable Archdeacon Thorp at his primary visitation, and most aptly entitled, 'A Septuagenarian Confession of Faith,' gives an admirable view of what this modern father of our church preached for more than half a century. His topic then, as it had been from the first, was the same 'as Paul the aged's,' when he declared to the men of Rome, 'I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek: for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith.' He preached 'The total depravity and helplessness of fallen man; the doctrine of justification exclusively by faith in the righteousness of Him who is emphatically called, by the prophet Jeremiah, *The Lord, Jehovah, our righteousness*, and the necessity of Divine influence to the life and walk of faith—these fundamental truths, derived from the word of God, and faithfully transfused into our formularies in all their fulness of meaning.' On that memorable occasion he touchingly said, 'I will not deny that I have felt pleasure in the opportunity thus afforded me, at this late period of my ministry and life, of testifying my concurrence with the noble declaration of the Apostle, and of avowing, thus publicly, my determination to live and die in the faith which he professed. I know of no other hope for eternity, in regard to my own salvation; and consequently, I have had, and have, nothing else to which to direct

the faith and hope of those who have been the objects of my ministrations.' He did not, however, regard the Gospel only or chiefly as a theory to be contended for. The subject matter of his preaching to other men, was the subject matter of his own experience. He knew he felt it upon trial, to be 'the power of God unto salvation'—his own salvation. He therefore added, quite in his usual style of exposition, 'Looking at the philosophy of the Gospel in the character which it bears of *aisthetic* philosophy (a term which I borrow from St. Paul's epistle to the Philippians—a characteristic which, from the time of our great Newton, has been wisely made the criterion of truth in all philosophical inquiries), looking at the Gospel in this light, I will say with confidence, that it is *the power of God unto salvation*. Of this I am fully assured by the lives and deaths of multitudes who have cordially embraced the doctrine contained in our text—of whom, very many in different ranks of life, have been brought under my own notice, who have lived by the faith of the Son of God;—who have adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour by their spirit and conduct,—and who have died in the lively hope of eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

It was said, in praise of Mr. Pitt's finished elocution, that he could have dictated a king's speech extempore; but it requires no brilliancy of genius to string together the common-place sentences which usually constitute such documents, conveying neither information nor principles. In the paragraphs which our gracious Queen was instructed, as the lawyers say, to address to Parliament at the conclusion of the late "laborious and protracted session," her Majesty laments the civil war in Spain; receives amicable assurances from all foreign powers; informs the world that the Canada disturbances have been suppressed, and hopes that "firm and judicious measures will empower" Parliament to restore a constitutional government; rejoices in the progress towards the entire abolition of Negro Apprenticeship; trusts that the mitigation of the law of Imprisonment for Debt, and the law for restricting Pluralities, (which are most oddly coupled together in one sentence) will respectively work well; as also the Irish Poor Law, and the Irish Tithe composition act; and finally thanks the House of Commons for the provision for the crown, the Duchess of Kent, and the public service; and compliments both Houses on their zeal and diligence, dismissing the members to their local duties in their respective counties, with an assurance that they may rely upon her Majesty's support, divided only by a comma from a sort of by-the-bye after-thought, that "it only remains to express an humble hope that Divine Providence may watch over us all, and prosper our united efforts for the welfare of our country." There is nothing deeply prayer-like in this abrupt appended phrase of Providence watching over us all; but as Lord Melbourne doubtless wished to accommodate those who think that our national dependance upon God ought not to be systematically thrust out from such solemn documents as an address from the sovereign to the great council of the realm, we are thankful for the recognition, though oblique, and dragged in with "it only remains," as if introduced more for form's-sake than from spontaneous impulse.

The topics alluded to in the speech, though nothing can be learned from the brief formal recapitulation of them, are of great interest and importance. To be still at peace amidst the many and alarming changes of various other nations, and to have seen a generation grow up to whom the name of war is but a sound, and who hear of Waterloo but as a dream of other days, is no ordinary national mercy, and demands heartfelt gratitude to God; as also the prompt suppression of the disturbances in our North American colonies, which might have led to much bloodshed and other calamities.—The transition from slavery first, and now from forced apprenticeship, to freedom, of the non-predial slaves in all our colonies, and of the field slaves in most of them, is a consummation which must gladden every benevolent and Christian heart.—The relaxation of our barbarous laws against Debtors, by which the honest man, pressed down by unavoidable calamity, was exposed as much as the most fraudulent to the oppression of a creditor, is as honourable to the enlightened wisdom as to the humanity of the nation. The undue facility given to the contraction of debt where there is no reasonable prospect of procuring payment but by the

imprisonment of the debtor, has been highly injurious to all classes of society; and both buyers and sellers, borrowers and lenders, will be on a better footing in proportion as property is made easily tangible, while no opportunity is allowed of gaining anything by personal severity.—The act for restricting Plurality of Benefices, we not only "trust," with her Majesty, but confidently anticipate, will give "increased strength and efficiency" to the Established Church; though our hopes would have been brighter if it had struck at the root of the evil, instead of lopping some of the branches.—We cannot participate in her Majesty's "great pleasure" upon the passing of the Irish Poor Law bill; because we believe it to be both unsound in principle and faulty in detail; and we anticipate from it nothing but an increase of vice, misery, and dissatisfaction. It can add nothing to the productive industry of the country; it cannot generate corn or potatoes, or money to buy them; what it gives to one it takes from another: so that rate payers must employ fewer hands, and maintain fewer mouths; the price of provisions must rise; and those who live by their labour will find that they cannot procure for their families as much food by it as they did before the parish overseer came into the market: so that two paupers will be made to relieve one; and the thoughtful and thrifty suffer for the improvident and idle. Charity in every shape, and among others, in almsgiving, is a Christian virtue; but poor's rates are not charity, and only tend to deaden it.

We "trust," with her Majesty, that the Irish Tithe-composition act "will increase the security of that property, and promote internal peace." It is, however, rather the measure of Sir R. Peel's cabinet than of Lord Melbourne's; for it omits the appropriation clause; the omission of which in Sir Robert's bill, was the cause of his ejection from power; while the present ministers, not very handsomely, keep their places, but back out of their principles We shall not much grudge the sacrifice, excessive as it is, of £25 per cent. to the landlord, for his risk in paying the tithes, and re-imbursing himself by increasing his rents, if the measure works peaceably, and the clergy receive seven tenths of their just income, without collision with their parishioners. But we are far from certain that this will be the case; for already the priests and Mr. O'Connell are telling the people that the measure will not, and ought not, to satisfy them; that tithe is tithe, whether payed directly or through rent; and that there is but one adequate remedy, namely, to abolish the Protestant Church Establishment. To this object the whole strength of Irish agitation, aided by the combined forces of English radicalism, infidelity, Popery, and Protestant Dissent, will now be directed; while mere political conservatism will propose no holier remedy than bribing the Irish priests with state salaries, which would be to add so much to the national guiltiness with regard to Ireland for which we are now suffering. The Irish Protestant Church, during a long series of years, neglected its solemn duties; it was proud, secular, sordid, and careless of its spiritual obligations; and consequently it obtained no firm hold upon the respect or sympathies of the people. Hence this retribution; and the way to avert it is not to add sin to sin, but to gird on strength to begin a new course; to endeavour to enlighten the people with a knowledge of the word of God; and to make them feel that Protestantism is not an act of parliament but a religion. Dark as are the clouds, we augur much blessing, through the mercy of God, from the gladdening revival of piety with which he has visited that persecuted Church.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

U. U. S.; R. A.; ALICIA; CLERICUS; AMICUS; J. S.; R. B.; and an illegible signature, are under consideration.

The Rev. C. Dodgson's letter (received as we are concluding our Number) will appear in our next.

A Member of the Society of Friends should have stated the reasons why he thinks it "unfair and un-Christian" for Justus to say that it is dishonest to buy a field for less than its value on account of its being subject to tithe; and thence to refuse to pay that outgoing, and to pocket the difference.

There is nothing in Dr. Smith's letter which would prevent our inserting it, with some remarks in reply; but it is useless to keep up an interminable controversy. It is not likely that we shall agree about the Marriage Act, the conduct of political Dissenters and journalists, and so forth. He has his opinion, and we have ours.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. } No. 10. OCTOBER. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE ORIGIN, INSTRUMENT, AND END OF REGENERATION.

(St. James i. 18, 21.)

For the Christian Observer.

IN the eighteenth verse of the first chapter of St. James's epistle, taken in connection with the twenty-first, which contains a practical exhortation grounded upon it, we have *four* weighty and important truths.

I. Regeneration is here resolved into the free will of God, as its sole moving cause: "Of His own will begat He us."

II. The instrument by which God operates the regeneration of a soul is declared to be "the word of truth engrafted" in it.

III. The co-operation on the part of man which God requires, and by His preventing grace effects, is this, that he should cease to do evil, and learn to do well—that he should study to cleanse himself from every pollution of flesh and spirit; and diligently wait upon the Lord, with an humble and docile spirit, in the use of the appointed means of grace. Or, to use the Apostle's words, "that he should lay apart all filthiness, and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word." And

IV. The end which the Divine mind contemplates in the whole of this process is twofold, the happiness of man—to save man's soul: and the glory of God—that men might be a kind of first fruits of God's creatures; dedicated, as were the first fruits of the typical dispensation, to the glory and praise of God.

I. In the 13th and 14th verses, the Apostle has taught that all sin is the product of man's depraved will and corrupt affections. He here teaches that all holiness is the product of the Divine will, freely moving in the regeneration of the soul. Thus he settles *to faith* the so long and so much disputed question of free will, by shewing that man's will is free to all evil; impotent to any good. Thus he teaches, in opposition to the doctrine which it has been attempted to force from another passage in this same epistle, that salvation is of grace, through faith; and that, not of ourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, for that we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. Our Lord has declared that unless a man be born again—of the Spirit, he cannot see, or enter into, the kingdom of God:

and all who are begotten again of that incorruptible seed which quickeneth and abideth for ever, are born, His Apostle tells us, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

This view of free will, which the Apostle here teaches, is of much practical importance, both to the *believer*, and to the *unregenerate*. It tends to humble man, to glorify God, and to promote the interests of true holines. It furnishes a clue to unravel the doctrinal perplexities in which some persons have entangled themselves in the study of this epistle; and to extricate from the heresy into which others have plunged, in, as they conceived, implicitly following it.

It is useful to the *unregenerate*, to stimulate him to exertion; to prevent him from trifling with present convictions, and saying to the convincing Spirit, "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee." For if we are not sufficient to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God alone: if without Christ we can do nothing, but can do all things through Christ strengthening us: if it is God alone that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure: how powerful a motive have we to work out our salvation with fear and trembling, while the day, not only of life but of grace, lasts; and before the night, not only of death but of spiritual abandonment and final reprobation, cometh, when no man can work? If without God's preventing grace effectually calling us we cannot even desire that which is good: if without His assisting grace we cannot bring to good effect those good desires which grace has implanted, how careful should we be to see that we refuse not him that calleth, but may never again call: that we resist not that Spirit which will not always strive with man, and which if grieved may be quenched for ever: that in this accepted time, this day of salvation, when the Spirit and the bride say, "Come," and whosoever will may drink of the water of life freely, we harden not our hearts, but study to co operate with Divine grace, and, by accepting of his proffered mercies, glorify God in this day of visitation.

Nor is the deep conviction that from God alone "all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed," less necessary to shield the believer from the assaults of spiritual pride and self-righteousness. Who maketh thee to differ from another? What hast thou, that thou didst not receive? these are questions which all have frequent occasion to ask of their own proud and carnal hearts. And it is the law of faith only, which prostrates man's will and thoughts in the dust, and raises upon their ruins a new creation of God, where old things have passed away, and all things have become new, which can answer these questions so as effectually to exclude boasting, and to wither every root of self complacency, which, springing up, would trouble and defile the soul.

The godly consideration of this profound truth, that God is everything, and man is nothing, is an essential preparative, in order that a soul may be wrought by Divine grace, with safety to itself, to a high degree of sanctification. He that is deeply impressed with this truth can contemplate his own attainments in holiness, as "the things freely given him of God," unmoved with spiritual pride. He can say, with profound and genuine humility, "By the grace of God I am what I am." No knowledge puffs him up. No favourable acceptance with man, no exercise of gifts or graces unduly elates him. He is deeply imbued with a sentiment which operates, habitually, as an

unfailing check upon the swellings of pride and self-righteousness, "not I, but the grace of God which was with me." Without this sentiment even sanctification would prove a dangerous snare. It would but raise him to a higher eminence, from which he would plunge into a deeper and more fatal ruin. His fate would be like that of Lucifer, son of the morning, when, falsely conscious of the possession of powers innate and underived, he said, in the pride of his heart, "I will sit upon the sides of the north. I will be like the Most High." And stretching forth to catch at the hollow and unsubstantial bubble of fame, he fell from the pinnacles of vain glory and ambition, and sunk into the profoundest abysses of the nethermost hell.

II. And as the *Divine will* is the *regenerating cause,* so the *Divine word* is the *regenerating instrument.* No doubt God can, and often does, effect his purposes of grace in a soul, by direct and immediate influences of His Spirit, without any vehicle, as in the case of infants, of the heathen, of the wholly uninstructed. But this is not his ordinary plan. God deals with us as with rational creatures, and accompanies every precept with an adequate motive to obedience. Christianity does not consist in unanalysed ecstatic feelings, in seraphic emotions, and in a sort, if I may so call it, of refined spiritual sensuality. But Christianity consists in a holy life, flowing from holy affections, and these again based upon holy and rational principles. The Sun of righteousness, which brings healing on its wings, pour light into the understanding, as well as warmth into the affections. The latter of these is peculiarly the office of the Divine Spirit; the former of the Divine word. For unless God were to make a distinct revelation to the mind of each individual of all the verities of the Gospel, and all the influential realities of the unseen world, and also of their connection with present conduct and affections, the Divine Spirit could not communicate light to the understanding without the Divine word:—the word of truth, as the Apostle here styles it, because it alone reveals, and introduces us into the regions of truth. "Sanctify them," says our Blessed Lord, "through the truth. Thy word is truth."

This world is to fallen man a region of delusion and error. Life is wasted in the pursuit of shadows which elude, or substances which wound him: yet he knows not at what he stumbles. Experience cannot teach him. It can but divert him from one lying vanity to another, but cannot guide him into the regions of truth, because with these the experience of the natural heart has never been conversant. The whole life therefore of a worldly man is altogether a delusion: he hunts a phantom. Nor is it merely that he wastes his intensest interests and affections upon vanities which cannot profit; but frequently the objects of his pursuit, if attained, would become positive misery. But however you may appeal to his understanding or his heart, while in the hurry of the chase, all is vain. He hears, or at least heeds, you not, until repeated disappointments have withered his energies, or until the grace of God has touched his heart—until the word of truth, brought home to his heart with power, by providence and grace, has shewn him the vanity of this world and the all-sufficiency of God. It is true, that when in any worldly pursuit, whether of wealth, ambition, fame, reciprocal affection, those gods of the world's idolatry, he finds that he is making no progress, even towards the immediate object of his pursuit; when he has been long

rolling his stone up the hill, and finds himself no nearer than before to fixing it in its resting place upon the top, he is tempted to ask himself soberly, 'And if I were to attain this anxiously desired object, what, after all, could it confer upon me?' But this is only the murmuring of disappointment, not the flashing conviction of truth. In disgust, he quits this for another vanity, which in due time disappoints him, either in the pursuit, or in the possession, and in its turn is deserted for another. Thus he runs the interminable circle of delusions, until all the energies of his mind are worn out. The spirits are wasted; the affections are blunted; the heart is withered. He has lost every faculty of enjoyment, every capability of happiness. In despair, he commits a moral suicide. He puts down within him those high aspirations of the heart excited to embrace God, and which God alone can satisfy; and is content to plod on his weary, monotonous way, without hope, as if now convinced by his own experience that happiness is an unattainable good. He lives a moral blight; and, if he could shape his destiny beyond the grave, would gladly compromise for annihilation.

This may appear an exaggerated picture; but it is the true history of many a sensitive heart, which has started from the post of life, gay, ardent, sanguine; and as far as animal spirits could affect it, happy. But the fine edge of its sensibilities has been blunted in collision with a coarse and cruel world, or its keen appetites were famished by disappointment. And now, sullen or selfish, it but catches, at distant intervals, glimpses of early hopes and feelings, through long vistas of memory, as if a fairy vision or a pleasing dream were let in upon it: a something sweet but visionary, which belongs, not to this world, at least now "in these degenerate days," and which it has no hope of realising in another. The very sentiment which I here quote from the poets—the prophets and expositors of feeling—which has been adopted by so many, from Homer, "first of men," to those of modern times, and re-echoed by the universal voice and heart, proves man's fallen and imperfect state, and that there is some exquisite and unalloyed bliss congenial to the nature and appetites of his soul, imagined, sighed for, but unattained! This "leaves him poor indeed," not, as he fancies, because fallen upon evil days and unpropitious circumstances, but because he is only the wreck of what man once was, and through redeeming love, shall yet more than be; because now he treads a blighted earth, as a prince in poverty, disgrace, and exile; expelled his native home and all its pure and elevated enjoyments; as one who has prostrated his high honour and virtue in the dust—"an archangel ruined." Oh, what a treasure to such a heart were that word of truth which reveals eternity; that peace of God which passeth all understanding, and which the world can neither give nor take away; that Christian philosophy and Christian spirit, which, blessing and being blest, would convert the "*nil admirari*" of selfish, cold hearted stoicism, into the warm, generous glow of universal love.

It is true, that you may not be able to trace, with equal clearness and distinctness, the various steps of this course in every individual; because all men are not possessed of the same moral accuracy, sensitiveness, and capability: but every natural heart, unless arrested by divine grace, treads the same downward course, from expectation to disappointment, from reiterated disappointment either to sour discontent, or to base and selfish worldliness. It passes, by a gradual yet sure process, from hope and life, in the panting chase of ever fleeting enjoyment, to sullen de-

spair, or to morbid apathy, and, in fact, moral death. How can a soul, thus dead, be begotten again unto a lively hope? What Elijah can touch it at every point of human sympathy, and warm it into life? What voice can bid this Lazarus arise? How can the soul, in any stage of its career of error and delusion, be effectually arrested, and translated from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God? The word of truth, brought home with convincing power to the soul by the Spirit of truth alone, can effect this. And *it can* effect it, because the word of truth draws aside the curtains of time and sense, which veil the spiritual and eternal world, and reveals to faith glorious realities, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive; and, in these, faith discerns motives to holiness, which when really believed and felt, must be omnipotent. The word of truth reminds the unawakened sinner, living, like the beasts that perish, wholly within the circumscribed limits of time and sense, that there is an ever present God, and a changeless eternity —that there is a heaven and a hell, and it sheds the light of infallible truth upon the two paths from this present life which lead respectively to each. The word of truth reads the heart. It sounds the depths of its depravity. It probes them, and brings to bear upon them the law of holiness. It describes the secret workings of a carnal mind, and anticipates every motion of sin, in word or deed, or thought, with a prohibitory command, and penal sanction—"Thou shalt not," else, "thou shalt surely die." The sinner, as he reads accurately delineated in the word of truth, the secret experience of his own corrupt heart, is convinced of sin, and feels, with horror, that he is in the noonday light of God's all pervading presence; under the eye of omniscience, and in the resistless grasp of Omnipotence. Alive without the law once; the commandment comes, sin revives, and he dies. The word of truth thus slays that it may make alive. To the *convinced* sinner it speaks of a Saviour, and points him to "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." And when the *pardoned* sinner, not content with the mere removal of guilt, but hungering and thirsting after righteousness, mourns over the inward power and pollution, and sighs for liberty and holiness, the word of truth tells him of that Spirit of holiness, which whosoever asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth. That Spirit granted to the prayer of faith, he is not only born again, but created in Christ Jesus unto good works: his heart is set at liberty to run in the way of God's commandments, and to shew forth the praises and the *virtues* of Him who hath called him out of darkness into his marvellous light.

III. But why does the word of truth fail with so many souls in this its reasonable and legitimate operation? or, rather, What is the co-operation, on the part of man, which grace requires and grace effects? It is this, that he should "lay aside all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word."

It is unnecessary to observe further here upon those terms "filthiness, and superfluity," or overflowing, "of naughtiness," than that the former expresses all sensual habits and passions, the latter all malignant; and that their combination is designed to express *all sin*. And can you expect that the Divine seed, "the word of truth," will germinate in your heart, and strike root downwards, and bear fruit upwards, to the saving of your soul, unless you study to cleanse yourself from every pollution of flesh and spirit, and to perfect holiness in the fear of God? Can you expect that your soul will dwell in the clear

atmosphere of a serene heaven, and that with the pure in heart you shall there see God; that you shall see Him as the "Father of mercies, and God of all comfort;" flooding with the pure beams of the uncreated sun the whole landscape of life, and kindling every object on which your eye reposes, in the moral or natural world, into animation, cheerfulness, and glory: can you expect this, when the element in which your soul moves is clouded; when your own spiritual vision is dimmed by the gross fumes which surfeiting and drunkenness, intemperance and uncleanness, generate and send up into it? Can you be drunk with wine, and filled with the Spirit? Can you wallow in the filthy mire of sensuality, and enjoy hopeful aspirations after, and present foretastes of, glory, honour, and immortality? Can you expect that the peace of God will rule in your heart, when your mind and conscience are defiled by wilful and habitual sin; when you never study to controul an irritable, envious, or malicious temper; when you never strive to banish uncharitable thoughts and feelings, or even perhaps to curb them, when they would vent themselves in angry words and unkind acts? Can you think to possess a comfortable assurance of the Divine favour and acceptance, and to enjoy that spirit of adoption which cries Abba, Father, when your carnal mind is enmity against God? Can you think to be delivered from the bondage of the fear of death, when all beyond the grave is vague or terrific; when your soul cleaveth to the dust; when your affections are set on things below, and not on things above; when your heart, your treasure, your conversation, are on earth and not in heaven? No: if you would enjoy God: if you would enjoy this world; if you would enjoy yourself; if you would taste real, substantial, permanent happiness; if, in the sense in which the Apostle here uses the term, you would *save* your immortal soul, you must lay aside all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness: you must not yield your members as instruments of unrighteousness, and of iniquity unto iniquity: thus drudging in the servile and laborious circle of sin, but in humble and implicit reliance upon Divine grace alone, you must wage a determined and uncompromising warfare against *all sin*.

Still more; you must "receive with meekness the engrafted word." If in the natural world you would reap the harvest, you must not only clear and prepare the ground, but you must also cast in the seed. If you would taste a new and better fruit, you must not only lop off the old branches, but you must introduce into the stock an improved graft. So also in the spiritual world. If you would enjoy the salvation of Christianity, you must not only "cease to do evil," but also "learn to do well." And as God alone can authoritatively declare his own ways and will; and as his revealed word alone makes known to man the nature of the spiritual world, and the qualifications essential to the enjoyment of it, you must receive the word of truth with meekness of wisdom; with the docility and teachableness of a little child; with implicit submission of the understanding to its doctrines, and of the will to its commands; with reverent and practical attention. "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth," should be the spirit in which you approach the word of God, and open, with reverence, each successive fold of his revelation to man. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Shew me the way, that thou, O God, being my helper, I may walk therein;—this should be the voice of your heart, and should be evinced as such by the whole tenor of

your life and conversation. You must, too, receive the word of truth through the various channels of instituted means by which God is pleased to dispense it; by the public worship of God in all his ordinances; by not only reading, but also by meditating upon the word of truth; by pious conversation, and pious books; by family devotion; by a still closer and more intimate communion with God in secret and devout prayer. Doubtless every day should witness your growth in grace and in the knowledge of God; but, to this end, you should in a peculiar manner sanctify God's Sabbaths, and, with sacred care, devote them exclusively to those purposes to which they were consecrated and set apart by God.

IV. Natural religion asks, What is the moral of that tale which the history of man tells? What the final cause of his creation and redemption? Is it the happiness of man, or the glory of God? Theological systems speculate, and each gives its several reply. But Christian experience uniformly answers that the combination of both these causes was the great end and object of the whole history of man; that the final cause of his creation and redemption was, that the glory of God should be magnified *in* and *by* the happiness of man. "Glory to God in the highest" is but half the angels' song; "on earth peace, good will towards men" fills up and completes the harmony. Peace on earth, good will to man brings, indeed, glory to God *in the highest*. All God's creatures magnify each some particular attribute, but his dispensation towards man reconciles, and blends, and magnifies them all—"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy work;" angels joyfully extol his goodness; devils are the reluctant monuments of his justice, holiness, and truth. But Christ incarnate and crucified for man, spans the infinite extremes of the divine nature, and bridges over, for the believing penitent, the otherwise impassable gulf which separated the justice, truth, and holiness, from the mercy, of God. In him "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

From this identification of man's happiness and God's glory the most blessed consequences result to the true Christian. The man who does not refuse to attach himself to the cause of God as he moves directly onwards over every impediment, conquering and to conquer, enters into a region of blessedness where all things must work together for his good. He stands as in a charmed circle, within which even curses are transmuted into blessings, and sorrows into joys. The rays of the Divine glory encircle him, and gild, and gladden, every object and circumstance with which he is conversant. His own mind partakes of the element in which he lives, and the atmosphere which he breathes: it illuminates with Christian cheerfulness the gloomiest night and the most depressing circumstances. It creates within him a paradise. He may be troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed. He may in circumstances be sorrowful; yet in spirit alway rejoicing; poor, yet making many rich; having nothing, yet possessing all things. Even his sensibility to suffering, and all the apparatus for inflicting it, with which the dungeons of this prison-house of earth are furnished, are calculated to work out, together with the peaceable fruits of righteousness, the most exquisite and intense felicity, for those who are exercised thereby. And faith, the root of

all moral excellence in man, when purified in the furnace of affliction, and by the heaviness of manifold temptations, does often, even here, and will still more hereafter, when every obstruction is removed, cause him to rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Even pains and persecutions, disappointments and sorrows, the foolish, the weak, the base things of the world; the things which are despised; yea, the things which *are* not, all become tributary to his happiness, and are converted into blessings. No self-immolating charity can sever him from the arms of Divine love, or fling from him a single blessing.* The most disinterested generosity, the most self-denying devotedness, is, as to its practical effects, the most intense selfishness. To love the brethren is but to pass from death unto life. To be partaker of Christ's sufferings is to be glad with exceeding joy. Yea, to suffer with Christ is to reign with him, and to be glorified together. To die daily for the brethren, and thus to offer ourselves up upon the sacrifice and service of their faith, is but to joy and rejoice with them all. To deny ourselves, to take up our cross daily, and follow Christ, to dedicate ourselves to God, as a kind of first-fruits of his creatures, is but to seek for glory, honour, and immortality. It is to cultivate our own truest happiness, now, and for ever. It is to cherish that Divine graft, that quickening and immortal seed "which is able to save your souls."

J. M. H.

DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE been often struck with the difference of aspect in which Christianity appears to different men; and which is often as great as if the parties professed so many different religions. I find one man who views it chiefly as a dispensation under which he may obtain pardon of sin; he was pressed down with the burden of his guilt; he saw no human way of escape; but the Gospel answers his anxious question "What must I do to be saved;" it is the doctrine of Christianity which chiefly impresses him. Another has not thought very deeply of sin or pardon; but his spirit was restless; the world is a scene of dissipation; he felt his need of repose, a home for his soul; and he considers the path to heaven as almost "a sentimental journey;" he does not dwell much upon doctrines; he is not very lucid in his expositions of "the scheme of salvation;" but holy contemplations and devout aspirations are the essence of his religion. Another is what is called a practical matter of fact man; he regards the Bible as a book which tells us our duties; he does not think much about sin and pardon; or about the internal exercises of spiritual emotion; but he examines into his daily conduct; is he just, active, regular in prayer and reading the word of God, and attentive to the rules of the Decalogue? This man is strict with himself, and not less strict in estimating the conduct of others. Another considers the Gospel chiefly as a code of benevolence;—I do not mean of God to man, but of man to his neighbour. He is not doctrinal, or sentimental, or inclined to scrutinize himself or others with severity; but he dwells upon the duty and the blessedness of philanthropy; he does

* See Woodward's Essays and Sermons, p. 269, ed. 3.

not think so much of men's souls as of their bodies; he relieves the wretched, visits prisons, opposes war and slavery, and looks for a millennium of universal good-will.

The above shades—to which others might be added—melt into each other. Some Calvinists incline to the first extreme; some Quakers to the fourth; some musing, delicately-constructed and naturally romantic minds affect the second; some less etherial spirits the third; but none are so strongly marked as not to assume some colouring from other classes. So, if I had taken a fifth class—that in which the imagination chiefly predominates—I might have pointed out many varieties of imagination; and also have shewn that though imagination is uppermost, it does not exclude, though it subordinates, questions of doctrine or duty. The phrenologists pretend to have discovered an organ which incites its possessor to give credence, without adequate evidence, to what is mystical, marvellous, and visionary; and I remember hearing it said, that the abettors of the opinions which about eight or nine years ago were beginning to be broached about the modern revival of miracles, must one and all have this assumed organ in a high state of excitement; though its practical influence as it affected their future conduct would depend upon its combination with other congenial or counteracting bumps; such as conscientiousness, cautiousness, acquisitiveness, veneration, courage, combativeness, and with relative weakness or strength of the intellectual organs. I do not vouch for the theory couched in this jargon; but, speaking soberly and scripturally, I cannot wonder if among those who gave themselves over to such vain imaginations, some went over to Irvingism and others to Popery; while others combined the mysticisms of both, without nominally forsaking the English Church.

The practical improvement of the foregoing remarks is this:—"Do I receive Christianity, not in shreds, not as a heap of glittering uncombined fragments, but as a whole; in its doctrines and its precepts; in its mysteries and its open vision; in its union of both tables of the law; in its relation to God, my neighbour, and myself; as a code of faith, an economy of grace, a rule of duty, and a source of blessedness; in one word, as it is given to mankind in the Holy Scriptures, and not as confined or distorted by the peculiarities of its frail recipients?"

N. O.

WHAT IS COMMON SENSE?

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

MEN often appeal to "Common sense;" and as the appeal appears irresistible to the appellant, he wonders that it is not so to every body else. But this disappointment arises from not considering what "common sense" really is. I am led to this remark by happening to take up one of your old volumes, in which I find Mr. (now Bishop) Wilson, in his Oxford Prize Essay, defining common sense to be, "The ordinary judgment of mankind implanted by the Creator, and capable of perceiving truth when presented to it by simple intuition." If this were a correct definition, common sense would be a kind of natural conscience, and might be appealed to in all nations and under every circumstance. But common sense, as the very expression im-

plies, is no such principle. It is merely the sense, or opinion, which the speaker, and those of his age, or circle, or nation, or religion deem to be common. It is nothing reasonable or scriptural; it is merely conventional; and so far from being a legitimate referee, it no more deserves that honour, than fashion, or custom, or prejudice. A barrister, in arguing a lunacy case before a jury of commercial men, appealed to their common sense as to whether it was consistent with sanity that a man who could be making money by selling Tea in Philpot Lane, London, would waste his money and time by buying and enjoying an estate in the country. A Hindoo would ask whether it is common sense that a person of high caste should eat with one of a low one; and whether common sense does not dictate that it is right to consign one's aged father to the waters of the Ganges: and the Bishop of Calcutta and the missionaries find great difficulty in making the people understand, or rather *feel*, that their "sense" of these matters, however "common" in India, is not conformable to right reason, or the will of God, or the general notions of mankind. Mr. Cobbett asked whether it is common sense to have hereditary legislators; the readers of the Christian Observer would rightly say, Yes; whereas Mr. Cobbett considered that *his* readers would say, No; otherwise he would not have put the question. If you go into a company of uneducated persons of any particular class, and betray your ignorance of what, to them, is familiar, they impute it to your want of common sense. The old woman thought George the Third had not common sense, because he did not know how an apple-dumpling was made. A ploughman would say that a man has not common sense who does not know wheat from barley. I once heard that a very intelligent woman, who had lived all her life in London, expressed surprise, in travelling by a stage-coach to York, that the horses were frequently changed. She thought the same horses would trot the whole journey without stopping. The coachman said that her common-sense might have taught her better; but she had no common sense on the subject: she had not mixed with any class of persons among whom there was any conventional opinion about horses or travelling. The inhabitants of central Africa would laugh, in chorus, at a traveller, as not talking common sense, if he spoke of water becoming so hard by cold, that men can walk over a river; and the Romanist devotees in a rustic village in Italy would think the denial of transubstantiation not only impious, but an outrage upon common sense. A popular orator, in exasperating the English peasantry respecting poor-laws, or the Irish peasantry respecting Protestantism, is really appealing to prejudice, not reason, when he speaks of common sense. A Radical once thought Sir R. Peel did not speak common sense; and Sir R. Peel has often, perhaps, mentally returned the compliment: for the sense which is common in one circle is not in another.

I contend, therefore, that an appeal to common sense is only an *argumentum ad hominem*; and that to convince or persuade an opponent it is utterly useless. All that it can do is to stop his mouth, by representing him as a fool if he does not agree with the appellant. It is not, as the Bishop of Calcutta defined it, "the ordinary judgment of mankind implanted by the Creator, and capable of perceiving truth when presented to it by simple intuition;" but the floating ideas of right and wrong, verity or falsehood, prevalent in a particular com-

munity, or section of a community. If in an English village Bishop Wilson had said, at a Missionary Meeting, "I ask whether so and so" —naming some absurd and debasing rite or doctrine of Hindoo idolatry and superstition—"is reconcileable to common sense," he would have been answered, by acclamation, in the negative; but there is no such "simple intuition" in India. Surely, then, the definition is wrong.

But still, if wrong, is the mistake of any importance? I answer, Yes: because it is setting up a false and changeable standard for the eternal standard of truth. If men are referred to common sense, then they may rightly measure their conduct by it; but if the sense or opinion which is so common in one place as to seem "simple intuition," is not so in another, and may not be truly scriptural in any, then it ought not to be made the standard of duty. I believe that the true and scriptural sense of things is not the common sense. The infidel asks, Is it common sense that water could be turned into wine, or a dead man be restored to life; and if common sense mean "simple intuition," and "the ordinary judgment of mankind," the argument is plausible. We must take higher ground, and not ask what are the common notions of men, but what is truth; for truth is not the voice of a multitude. In Turkey the common sense of the people is, that Mohammedanism is a Divine revelation; and it is "nonsense" to deny it. Appeals therefore to common sense are futile; we must rather try to correct common sense by right reason: and in matters of religion Christianity is right reason. The Bible can be proved to be a Divine revelation: and this being once granted, a miracle attested in it is as credible as an ordinary occurrence.

Clergymen sometimes feel the disappointment which I have alluded to. They appeal to common sense; but *their* common sense is not the common sense of their hearers. Young Melancthon thought he had only to present religious truth to the ordinary judgment of mankind for them to perceive it: but he found "old Satan too wily for young Melancthon." Where the common sense is correct it may be lawfully appealed to; as St. Paul often appealed to popular opinions when addressing the heathen: but this must be done with due discrimination; for if we have incorrectly estimated the popular opinion, the appeal is lost. Were a jailor to throw open his gates, appealing to the common-sense of the prisoners, that crime ought to be punished for the common good, and that therefore they ought not to escape, he would find that their notion of common sense, and "the greatest happiness principle," was to procure their freedom. In like manner, a clergyman, in making his appeals to men, ought to consider how they will be met by the passions, prejudices, and interests of his hearers; and not to suppose that what is common sense, either in a company of philosophers or among true Christians, will be responded to by the mass of mankind, whose visions and aspirations are bounded by objects the most grovelling and contracted. L. S. G.

MORAL PARALLELS (TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES).

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In my former paper I shewed the folly and fallacy of hastily rejecting a parallel case, because it is not in all respects parallel to the case

upon which it is brought to bear; and I proved by examples in point, first, that the particulars in which the cases are not parallel may be mere circumstantials, and not in the least essential to the argument; and secondly, that in some instances the argument, so far from being weakened, may become stronger than if the cases had been parallel. The difference by which the cases are not parallel may be of such a nature as to make out a stronger case. As this is a fallacy of almost daily occurrence, and involving mistakes of great practical importance, I will give another example, in order that my meaning may be clearly understood.

A worthy clergyman in England wrote a sermon in favour of Temperance Societies, and he brought forward those beautiful maxims of St. Paul:—"It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." "Wherefore if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." "Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." These inspired maxims are so exquisitely in point to the argument, that they have justly been termed the charter of Temperance Societies. Yet in the case now alluded to, the clergyman was persuaded, by some injudicious friends, to abandon this powerful argument from Scripture, and to omit it in the publication of his sermon, on the ground that the two cases were not parallel in the following respects:—

1st. Because St. Paul, in his argument, is speaking of believers or brethren in Christ, and not of the world at large, as brethren in our common nature; whereas the principle of Temperance Societies is intended to be brought to bear upon men of all nations, sects, and religions, and even upon persons making no profession of religion at all.

2nd. Because St. Paul is speaking of a practice innocent in its own nature, but wounding the over-scrupulous conscience of a weak brother, and causing him to do—not what is wrong, but—what he believes to be wrong.

3rd. Because the drunkard is by no means "grieved" at seeing me make use of strong drink, nor is his conscience at all offended by it; on the contrary, it pleases him right well, and sets his conscience perfectly at ease to see me do so.

This reasoning is a specimen of that kind of wretched fallacy which is eternally recurring, and which is cheating us every day into false conclusions, and by which the author in question was persuaded to abandon one of the best and soundest arguments with which any case ever was supported.

For, first, we are not at liberty to injure our neighbour or our brother in any sense of the term; inasmuch as we are required to love our neighbour as ourselves, and to do him all the good we possibly can. And our Lord, in the parable of the good Samaritan, has explained the word neighbour in so wide a sense as to include every individual, of every nation or language, who may come within the sphere of our influence, or upon whose welfare or happiness our conduct may in any way operate. Therefore, although it is granted that St. Paul, in these passages, is speaking only of brethren in Christ, yet the non-parallelism is perfectly non-essential, and does not in the least invalidate the argument.

But, secondly, the remaining parts of the argument, in which the cases are not parallel, namely, the second and third, so far from weakening the argument, make it immensely stronger than if they were parallel. For first, if, according to St. Paul's rule, I may not lead my brother to do that which is indifferent in its own nature, so long as he merely *thinks* it wrong, much more is it wicked in me to do that which will encourage him to do that which *is* wrong. And lastly, as to his not being "grieved at it," this makes the matter no better, but rather worse. For if, by any thing which I do, I lead my brother into sin, it is far better that he should be "grieved at it;" and his not being grieved at it, is only a proof that I have seared his conscience, as well as corrupted his practice. So that the two cases are parallel as to all essentials; and the points in which the cases are not parallel do not weaken but strengthen the argument, and constitute an argumentum à fortiori of the very best and soundest description. And if it be wicked to violate the law of love, and to injure a brother in the particular way that St. Paul is speaking of, much more is it wicked to destroy the souls for whom Christ died, by assisting and abetting the self-deception of the poor drunkard, by doing any thing which has a tendency to blind his eyes and sooth his conscience, and encourage him on the road to temporal and eternal ruin.

But this question is of immense and universal importance, because by this kind of quibbling the Scripture may be made to mean anything or nothing, and its directions and commands loosened and frittered away, till they become no bond at all upon men's conduct. For it is evident that the Scripture can only lay down broad general principles of action. It is utterly impossible to give specific directions exactly parallel to every particular case; for then indeed the "world could not contain the books that should be written."

By not attending to this distinction, by looking out for exact parallelisms in minute particulars, while we should be grasping the broad principle of the command, or seizing the scope of the parable, all the parables of our Lord, and all the commands of his apostles, may be set aside; or, what is worse, they may be so perverted that Scripture may be in a sense quoted against itself; and these pseudo-interpreters, by contending about the exact words, or by confining their attention to mere circumstantials, while they overlook the spirit of the text, have learnt, even from the Scripture itself, to strain at a gnat, while they swallow a camel.

H. JEFFREYS.
(Archdeacon of Bombay.)

*** Our correspondent, in adducing the above apt illustration of his remarks on Moral Parallels, is incidentally labouring in his vocation; for to his other claims on public gratitude he adds that of being the coryphæus of the Temperance cause in India. From his correspondence, as Secretary of the Bombay Temperance Society, we learn that Temperance Societies are now established in almost every station of any importance in the three Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay. The Indian supreme and local governments appear sincerely desirous of checking, as far as possible, the use of ardent spirits; but they are obliged to carry into effect the regulations issued in England, which unhappily still sanction, and, we believe, direct, the issue of spirits as a portion of the soldiers' daily necessaries. Many merchants, underwriters, and other private indi-

viduals, have far outstripped the British government and the public feeling of England, in regard to this important question; in proof of which, we will transcribe the following extract from a letter, addressed to Archdeacon Jeffreys, by Captain Guthrie, the commander of the Ship Adelaide. Should it be said that this case goes too far, as the ship was worked under the high-pressure principle of abstinence, not only from ardent spirits, but from wine, beer, and all other intoxicating potions, we may apply the Archdeacon's doctrine of parallels, and say, à fortiori, may ardent spirits be abstained from without injury, and with manifest benefit.

"As the Adelaide has been sailed on the temperance system since we left London, a few brief remarks on the discipline and good conduct of the ship's company may not be unacceptable. I have to state, for your information, that, after the usual occurrences of a voyage from England, and during our sojourn at Bombay, there has not been a drop of spirits, wine, or beer, served out to the crew in any instance. Mark the effect. The people on all occasions have not only done their duty well, but cheerfully, and a more correct set of men I have never sailed with. And I am happy to add, that I have never been disgusted with that habit of profane swearing, and obscene language, so common on board ship, while under the influence of spirits; and, although this is my first voyage on the system, from what I have observed, I shall be always glad to sail on the same plan, and I am convinced that it has the effect of raising Jack from his degraded state to that of a rational creature. The whole crew (forty) appear really happy and comfortable amongst themselves, and enjoy the best possible health. The owners, Messrs. Baring, Brothers, and Co., have been extremely liberal in providing those comforts seldom found in other ships. In short, the whole system works well; and I hope to see other ships following the example, as it would tend very much to improve the moral character of seamen, without deteriorating from their qualifications as sailors."

HOOKER ON EPISCOPACY.

For the Christian Observer.

We fear much danger to the true doctrine of episcopacy from the effects of reaction, in consequence of the exaggerated statements which have lately been promulgated respecting it. When persons are asked to believe too much, they are very apt to revenge themselves by believing too little. We lately took occasion, in our remarks upon Mr. Cumming's sermon, to shew, in few words, the basis of the arguments by which episcopacy is proved to be a scriptural institution; and we request permission of our readers to transcribe the following passages from the truly "judicious" statements of Hooker on this important question, as exhibiting the doctrine of the church of England at once in its strength and its moderation, as distinguished from modern notions of church government, on either the Independent or the Presbyterian system of discipline, and from the untenable claims to which we have alluded. It never was more necessary to set forth frequently and urgently the solid foundation on which this doctrine of our church, and of all Christian antiquity rests, than now, when it is assailed by dissent as a fabrication of popery, and some colour is given to the accusation, by the inflated representations of some, who say that to be Anglican is not to be Protestant. In answer to both, listen to the following discriminating remarks of the venerable Richard Hooker.

"The foul practices which have been used for the overthrow of Bishops, may perhaps wax bold in process of time, to give the like assault even there, from whence at this present they are most seconded. Nor let it ever dismay them who

suffer such things at the hands of this most unkind world, to see that heavenly estate and dignity thus conculcated, in regard whereof so many of their predecessors were no less esteemed than if they had not been men, but angels amongst men."

"A thousand five hundred years and upward the church of Christ hath now continued under the sacred regiment of Bishops. Neither for so long hath Christianity been ever planted in any kingdom throughout the world but with this kind of government alone; which to have been ordained of God, I am for mine own part as resolutely persuaded, as that any other kind of government in the world whatsoever is of God. In this realm of England, before Normans, yea before Saxons, there being Christians, the chief pastors of their souls were Bishops."

"Many things there are in the state of Bishops, which the times have changed; many a parsonage at this day is larger than some ancient bishoprics were; many an ancient Bishop poorer than at this day sundry under them in degree. The simple hereupon, lacking judgment and knowledge to discern between the nature of things which changeth not, and these outward variable accidents, are made believe that a Bishop heretofore and now, are things in their very nature so distinct, that they cannot be judged the same.

"Yet to men that have any part of skill, what more evident and plain in Bishops, than that augmentation or diminution in their precincts, allowances, privileges, and such like, do make a difference indeed, but no essential difference, between one Bishop and another? As for those things in regard whereof we use properly to term them Bishops, those things whereby they essentially differ from other Pastors, those things which the natural definition of a Bishop must contain; what one of them is there more or less appliable unto Bishops now than of old?"

"This we boldly therefore set down as a most infallible truth, That the Church of Christ is at this day lawfully, and so hath been sithence the first beginning, governed by Bishops, having permanent superiority, and ruling power over other ministers of the word and Sacraments."

"The Apostles of our Lord did, according unto those directions which were given them from above, erect churches in all such cities as received the word of truth, the Gospel of God. All churches by them erected, received from them the same faith, the same Sacraments, the same form of public regiment. The form of regiment by them established at first was, "*That the laity of people should be subject unto a College of Ecclesiastical persons which were in every such city appointed for that purpose.*"

"But forasmuch as the Apostles could not themselves be present in all Churches, and as the Apostle St. Paul foretold the Presbyters of the Ephesians, *that there would rise up from amongst their own selves, men speaking perverse things to draw disciples after them;* there did grow in short time amongst the Governors of each Church, those emulations, strifes, and contentions whereof there could be no sufficient remedy provided, except according unto the order of Jerusalem already begun, some one were endued with Episcopal Authority over the rest, which one being resident might keep them in order, and have pre-eminence or principality in those things, wherein the equality of many agents was the cause of disorder and trouble. This one President or Governor, among the rest, had his known authority established a long time before that settled difference of name and title took place, whereby such alone were named Bishops."

"It was the general received persuasion of the ancient Christian world, that *Ecclesia est in Episcopo*, the outward being of a church, consisted in the having of a Bishop. That where Colleges of Presbyters were, there was at the first equality amongst them, St. Jerome thinketh it a matter clear: but when the rest were thus equal, so that no one of them could command any other as inferior unto him, they all were controllable by the Apostles, who had that Episcopal Authority, abiding first in themselves, which they afterwards derived unto others. The cause wherefore they under themselves appointed such Bishops as were not every where at the first, is said to have been those strifes and contentions, for remedy whereof either the Apostles alone did conclude of such a regiment, or else they, together with the whole Church, judging it a fit and needful policy, did agree to receive it for a custom; no doubt but being established by them, on whom the Holy Ghost was poured in so abundant a measure for the ordering of Christ's Church, it had either Divine appointment beforehand, or Divine approbation afterwards, and is in that respect to be acknowledged the ordinance of God, no less than that ancient Jewish regiment, whereof, though Jethro were the deviser, yet after that

God had allowed it, all men were subject unto it, as to the polity of God, and not of Jethro. That so the ancient Fathers did think of Episcopal regiment; that they held this order as a thing received from the blessed Apostles themselves, and authorized even from Heaven, we may perhaps more easily prove, than obtain that they all shall grant it who see it proved."

ROMANIST USE OF OXFORD TRACT DOCTRINES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In your Number for March 1837, you ventured a prediction on the subject of the injudicious mode of controversial argument adopted by the learned authors of the Oxford Tracts for the Times. Your words alluded to, were the following: "The Romanists are *perfectly logical* in saying that if you admit of prayers for the departed you *must* also admit of a Purgatory; for to pray for the spirits of just men translated to the enjoyment of heaven, is worse than folly. Yet these Tracts take great pains to make a distinction, and actually bring it forward as their chief engine for the conversion of the Romanists from the error of Purgatory. The engine will recoil upon those who venture to use it."

I trouble you with these lines merely to put you in possession of the means of proving very completely that you had good reason to anticipate the result which you made bold to foretel. I have just been reading a pamphlet newly published, under the following title: "Purgatory: A Correspondence between the Rev. R. H., Vicar of Catton, and J. P. L., a Norwich Catholic, originating from the Lectures of the Rev. J. Collingridge, M. A. N."

The vicar appears to have done all that could be done with the argument of the Oxford Tract school of theologians; but if you will be at the pains to examine the Correspondence, you will, if I do not greatly miscalculate, find, in the defence by the Norwich Catholic, a striking illustration of the justice of your prediction.

A CHURCHMAN.

*** We never heard of the correspondence alluded to by A Churchman; but it did not require any great sagacity to foresee that Romanist disputants would zealously avail themselves, on this and various other points, of the anti-protestant statements in the Oxford Tracts; as they are doing to a wide extent, and with powerful effect, in their preaching, conversations, and publications, both in Great Britain and Ireland and upon the continent. If indeed we grant to Rome all that the Oxford Tracts concede, there is so little left to contend for, that not a few persons are likely to follow the example of the lady, who, being remonstrated with by Archbishop Laud for turning papist, told him that she disliked a crowd, and as she saw which way he and his friends were travelling, she went on first. The Roman Catholic priests confidently predict that the Oxford Tract doctrines will afford powerful aid in preparing the way for the restoration of popery throughout England and Ireland, to the subversion of the Protestant Episcopal church as a national establishment, and its ultimate downfall as a religious communion. They are sanguine also as to the general effect of these doctrines, in weakening the general bond of protestantism throughout Christendom. We feel persuaded that they are mistaken, and that the rent will be very partial, and will never reach to the foundation of our church; but it behoves all her faithful members to be on their guard against the very possibility of such a calamity.

ON LA PLACE'S ALGEBRAICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST MIRACLES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In an article on "Animal Magnetism," in the Dublin Review (a work dedicated to Popery, and which therefore should be narrowly watched,) I find a translation of a passage in the much celebrated work of the infidel La Place upon Probabilities, which, as it contains matter that has been insidiously employed against Christianity, ought not to pass unnoticed, though it has been abundantly refuted in the replies to Hume's well-known arguments upon miracles. I should however state that the writer in the Dublin Review adduces La Place only against himself, without formally adopting the sentiment which is expressed, or making himself to the full extent responsible for it.

La Place maintains, that the more extraordinary the fact attested, the greater the probability of error or falsehood in the attestor. Simple good sense, he says, suggests this; and the calculation of probabilities confirms its suggestion. There are some things, he adds, so extraordinary, that nothing can balance their improbability.

The position here laid down is, that "the probability of error, or of the falshood of testimony, becomes *in proportion* greater, as the fact which is attested is more extraordinary." Hence, assuming this to be true, as a fact becomes extraordinary in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, &c., or *n*th degree, so it becomes improbable in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or *n*th or highest possible degree. Or, in other words, it becomes so extraordinary that nothing can counterbalance its improbabilities. Now all this would amount to a mathematical demonstration, if you could only shew that the position assumed to be true is an undisputed axiom; namely, that as a fact is extraordinary it becomes improbable, in short that they are as two variable quantities, which vary in a direct ratio to one another. It shall be my endeavour to shew that they do not vary in this manner; that the improbability of a fact depends on other things, not on its being extraordinary; that a very ordinary fact may be very improbable under certain circumstances, and in the same manner a very extraordinary fact may be very probable. Before we judge an extraordinary fact to be improbable, we should consider whether the *circumstances of the case* render it improbable or otherwise. The circumstances of the case may be such as to render it extremely *probable* that something very extraordinary should arise out of them. Great things beget their like, and extraordinary agencies produce extraordinary effects. It falls out contrary to our expectation when it is otherwise:

"Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus."

If, on the contrary, the circumstances, or acting causes, be of a very ordinary and insufficient kind, or of an extremely doubtful kind, such as the system of jugglery and deceit practised by magnetizers, it is very improbable that the extraordinary effects that are said to arise, should be true; and the whole thing should be submitted to the test of competent examiners. The plausible sophistry of La Place has been made much use of to discredit the truth of miracles, and of that Divine religion which is attested by them. Hume goes so far as to say, that a miracle, or a suspension of the laws of nature, is so extra-

ordinary, that no amount of testimony can establish its credibility. In truth, nothing can be more extraordinary than a miracle, except it be a thing inconsistent with nature, and therefore impossible, or, in other words, contradictory to itself. That the human trunk, which has no visual organs, should be able to see, is a plain contradiction. But miracles which do not involve any contradiction are certainly the most extraordinary things that can happen, leaving out of the question the probability or improbability of their having actually been performed.

Now let us examine the circumstances connected with the performance of miracles. They are said to be performed in the attestation of a religion, which, upon the strictest inquiry into it, is found to be in every way most excellent, and worthy of Him who is declared to be its Author, God. Now how could a revelation be proved to have come from God, but by miracles? Paley goes so far as to say, in the introduction to his Evidences of the Christian Religion, that he cannot conceive any other way, in which a Divine religion can be attested, than by miracles. We have at least good reason to consider it in *the very highest degree probable* that a Divine religion would be attested in this *most extraordinary* manner: and in point of fact that religion, which may with the justest reason be considered a Divine revelation, from its inherent excellencies and holiness, is declared to have been *so* attested through the whole course of its development, from the beginning of the world to the appearance of Jesus Christ; and the Bible, which contains the history of that religion through all those ages, is throughout a book of wonders.

We have no reason, however, to discredit the account of these wonders because they are so extraordinary; but, on the contrary, we have reason to consider it *highly probable* that God would accompany a revelation coming from himself with miracles: and when we come to examine the Christian religion, we find it to be so holy, so just, and so good; and the Teacher of it concentrating in himself every thing that is excellent and glorious; and withal so full of grace and truth, that we are constrained to think that this holy religion, and He who taught it, must have come from God: we then are no longer astonished that God should confirm his word with signs from heaven, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.

It may be said, that a religion which is so holy that it *proves itself* to be from God, needs not the aid of miracles. In some respects it does not; for "miracles are for a sign, not to them that believe but to them that believe not." The aid of miracles is required, in order to call the attention of those who do not believe, or whose faith is weak, to that religion in attestation of which they are wrought. An extraordinary fact, if well supported by good and credible witnesses —if it be a fact which in any way concerns our welfare—should lead us to examine the circumstances attending it; and so a well-attested miracle should lead the careless to think, and examine the religion which it bears testimony to. This was the effect it had in our Saviour's days upon many who saw them; they immediately began to think not so much of the miracles as of him who wrought them; how holy and how Divine He must be, and how true and excellent that doctrine must be which he taught. When he rebuked the winds and the sea, they were astonished, and said, "What manner of man is this?" When, at his command, they let down the net, and enclosed

a great number of fishes, so that their nets broke, Simon Peter was overpowered at the thought of the holiness of Him who wrought the miracle, and, by comparison, at the thought of his own sinfulness; and he fell down at Jesu's feet, and said, "depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." When Jesus was *teaching* at Capernaum, there was a man which had an unclean spirit; which when Jesus had rebuked, and had commanded to come out of him, they were all amazed, and said, "What thing is this, what *new doctrine* is this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him." On others his miracles had not this good effect of calling their attention to him and his doctrine; for which reason he rebuked the Pharisees, and said, "If ye believe me not, yet believe me for the work's sake: the works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." Miracles, so far from being incredible, are for the most part, if not *always*, of such a palpable nature, that there is no mistaking them; and were intended to be so, in order that they might be *an evident* sign and witness to the truth of religion, which could not be so clearly attested in any other way.

It has been said, that the probability of error, or of the falsehood of testimony, becomes greater in proportion as the fact which is attested is extraordinary. Now let us examine any one of the extraordinary facts spoken of in the Bible, as to whether any error or falsehood of testimony is *at all* probable, and we shall see the fallacy of this assumption. First, as to the probability of error. One of the extraordinary facts is related as follows, in Matt. viii. 24: "And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves; and his disciples came to him, and awoke him, and said, Lord, save us, we perish: and he said unto them, why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith: then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea, and there was a great calm." Now what possible supposition of error or mistake can be imagined in any one of the circumstances attending this miracle? Is it possible for any individual, who is sailing in a vessel, to doubt whether he sees a great storm, and the waves beating over the ship; or, on another occasion, when there is a perfect calm, to have any doubt about it whether his eyes deceive him? Both these are ordinary events at sea, and palpable to the senses: and yet the astonishing fact that at the voice of a man, apparently like ourselves, the raging of the tempest should immediately cease, and there should be a great calm, is equally palpable to the senses: *nor is there one tittle more probability of error* in the one case than in the other. The same may be affirmed of every other miracle said to have been performed. They who witnessed them could not be mistaken as to whether they were true or not.

As to the probability of their giving a designedly false account of what they saw, we cannot entertain the notion, when we consider the faithful and upright character of the witnesses. When John sent two of his disciples to Jesus, saying, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" he wished to have his faith confirmed by the testimony of Jesus himself to the truth, that he was the Messiah that should come: he rested his faith entirely upon that testimony, never for a moment doubting that two of his disciples, whose character for integrity he well knew, would faithfully report the answer of Jesus; nevertheless the answer they returned was of the *most extraordinary* kind. When Jesus said to them, "Go and shew John again what

things ye do see and hear: the blind receive their sight, the deaf hear, the lepers are cleansed, the dead are raised up, the poor have the Gospel preached unto them, and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." The relation of these astonishing wonders, combined with the holy and merciful character of Jesus as the preacher of the Gospel to the poor, fully confirmed his faith in Jesus: while, at the same time, we may be sure that not even the thought passed in his mind, that the disciples who brought back this report could have fallen into an error, much less have been guilty of a falsehood. These two honest faithful witnesses were as his two eyes and his two ears, by whose testimony he was now fully assured that Jesus was he that should come; the Christ, the Saviour of the world. Even so let us believe. Amen.

C. E. P.

*** There is an able reply to Hume's argument in Dr. Chalmers's Evidences of Christianity, lately reprinted in the third volume of his collected works. It contains some points not included in the reasonings of Campbell, Paley, &c. Mr. Babbage also, in what he calls The Ninth Bridgewater Treatise, has adduced some very striking mathematical arguments to demonstrate that testimony is adequate to the proof of miracles; and that the largest induction which can be made, is not sufficient to shew that a deviation from what are considered the laws of nature may not take place, as in the case of the scriptural miracles of raising the dead to life, however improbable such an event antecedently appeared.

ON THE CREDULITY OF SOME RELIGIOUS PERSONS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

The credulity, as to supernatural interferences with the laws of nature, which occasionally appears in religious persons, is a fertile subject of ridicule to the scoffer, and a source of painful embarassment and trial to reflecting persons, friendly to religion. The temptation to deny or evade the fact, presses heavily on this latter class; and like all temptations affecting large bodies of men, very frequently prevails. But, as in temporal matters, so also, and much more emphatically, as regards higher interests, "Honesty is the best policy." It is far better, and more Christian, to admit the whole truth, and then obviate the resulting difficulty, or even leave it unexplained, than to "speak deceitfully for God," and shelter ourselves from our perplexities behind some "refuge of lies," built upon the sand, and sure to fall when the flood shall come, and the storm beat upon it.

The following observations, while they admit that religious feeling may, in particular instances, indirectly foster one species of credulity, are intended to shew that no argument can be drawn from this circumstance, unfavourable to the claims of religion.

A knowledge of the most common phenomena of the material world, is the very first result of experience, and precedes, by a considerable interval, the conception of an intelligent Creator and Governor. This is doubtless one reason why these phenomena strike the mind simply as facts, instead of raising it to the contemplation of the Intelligence from whose will they must be supposed to proceed. Another springs indirectly out of the harmony and permanence of natural laws, and the uniform operation of similar causes. Not that this, which is

indeed the highest evidence of wisdom, would of itself tell unfavourably even on the imagination; for it would be quite as natural to refer irregular occurrences to blind chance, as to see in uniformity and order the mere result of necessity. But the vacillation, inconsistency, and contradictions which characterize the results of volition as exhibited amongst mankind, become almost incorporated with our idea of that attribute, and lead us to overlook the evidence of its existence where these concomitant imperfections are wanting; the effect of these causes, concurring with others which must be sought in the moral condition of our species, is to render the ordinary conception of deity so vague and unreal, as to amount to little more than a poetical personification of the laws of the material universe. This state of mind is undoubtedly unlikely to lead men to expect a suspension of those laws; but it tends directly to atheism, and those who are completely under its influence are virtually *αθεοι εν κοσμω*, "without God in the world."

Now if these feelings, in any particular case, be replaced by a distinct impression of the personality and active agency of the Deity, the causes we have been considering will act in an opposite direction. The laws of nature will lose something of their apparent stability, when resolved into acts of volition; since these, in our ordinary experience, are subject to continual change from caprice, enlarged knowledge, or altered circumstances. This relaxation in our views is even reasonable, so far as concerns the admission of moral analogies as elements in our calculations respecting the immutability of physical laws, (an important principle, and fatal to Hume's argument against miracles); but it may easily be carried to an excess which implies a forgetfulness of the plainest dictates of experience, and a disregard of *all* analogy, moral as well as physical. This error is preferable to the former, because it implies a distinct persuasion of the personality of the Deity, and may co-exist with just apprehensions and feelings, respecting his moral attributes; or, in other words, with genuine religion. But as it involves no particular views respecting this latter subject, it may also be found amongst persons whose opinions are so fundamentally erroneous as to make them, in effect, worshippers of a false and imaginary Divinity. Neither Deism, commonly so called, Manicheism, nor even Polytheism, is exempt; except so far as the virtual Atheism of most Deists may operate as a preservative. It will spring up as a casual weed wherever a belief is entertained of the existence of a Being, good or evil, superintending human affairs, and controlling the material universe. Hence, it is found occasionally in most sections of the Christian church, though least frequently in those whose coldness repels or chills the zealous and warm-hearted. It may, perhaps, be expected to thrive best in the neighbourhood of Antinomianism; for he who has persuaded himself that the moral government of God is suspended in his favour, may reasonably hope for an exemption from the consequences of physical laws. Even scriptural views respecting special grace, may by some weak minds be thus perverted; but in no case can an argument be drawn for the falsehood of a doctrine, from circumstances which might be expected to attend its reception, even on the supposition of its truth.

U. U. S.

ON AN OMISSION IN THE CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE EXTRACTS FROM TYNDAL'S PROLOGUES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I cordially join with Bernard (Christian Observer for April, p. 218) in expressing the hope that, "the Selections from the Reformers and Fathers of the Church of England," issued by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, may be widely circulated. They will form, as he states, an excellent antidote to the poison of various modern publications, among which may be included some on the list of the Society itself. It was, however, with regret, that on examining the Tract to which he refers, "Extracts from Tyndal's Prologues to the five books of Moses," I discovered the entire omission, without any notice, of the valuable statement of Tyndal with respect to the Old Testament and the New, which is a part of the prologue to the book of Exodus, which gives a comparison between the law and the Gospel, and states fully the doctrine of the Reformation on that unspeakably important subject, Justification by Faith. The omission does not appear to have been caused by want of room; and even if that had been the case, surely it would have been preferable to have omitted some of the remarks respecting vows in a subsequent page. The passage omitted might be interesting to your readers, if inserted in your pages. I do not find these Prologues in the Rev. L. Richmond's Fathers of the Church, but they are in the black letter folio edition; in Russell's reprint; and in the British Reformers, published by the Religious Tract Society. The passage omitted will be found in the folio edition, at p. 9: "Finally, God hath two testaments, the olde and the new. The olde testament is those temporall promises," &c. &c.

I observe some other alterations and omissions; but these are of smaller importance, though some are of passages condemnatory of the Church of Rome.

A DISTRICT SOCIETY MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

ON THE SUPPRESSION OF INFANT BAPTISM BY THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In my remarks upon the Publications of the Religious Tract Society, in your last Number, I adverted to the compact by which the Society binds itself to suppress all allusion to infant baptism;—a confederation contrary to Scripture and godly simplicity, and productive of most mischievous results. One of those results is, that the Anabaptists, who used to be a small and almost powerless body, have gained a vantage ground of influence which they never before possessed, and from which they are assailing the general communion of the faithful of all ages, nations, and denominations, as "a sect;" themselves being the body of Christ; their little, narrow, party-boundaries, the walls and buttresses of the true Zion; their Shibboleth, the voice of Scripture; and their few, scattered, and for the most part ill-instructed disciples, the genuine catholic church. If any of your readers think

that I have exaggerated their language, I need only refer them to Mr. Hinton's Letter to Lord Bexley; in which that Baptist minister tells us, that if the Bible Society will not pay for translations of the New Testament in which baptism is rendered by some word equivalent to immersion, it is (with two notes of admiration) "the institution of *a sect*—the Pædobaptist Society!!" All Christendom is "a sect," except the catholic communion of Anabaptists. The primitive church; the Latin, Greek, and Armenian communions; Protestants and Papists; Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents; the fathers, the reformers, the martyrs, the great body of the faithful in all ages, are "the Pædobaptist sect;" and Mr. Hinton and his friends are "the church." The ludicrous arrogance of the three tailors in Tooley Street, who addressed Parliament as "We the people of England," was tame compared with this ecclesiastical assumption. And yet Mr. Hinton has some ground for his argument: for why should not the Bible Society succumb to the Anabaptists as well as the Tract Society? The accredited weekly organ of the evangelical Dissenters, "The Patriot," in its displeasure against the Christian Observer—which it represents as being worse than that obscene, blasphemous, and legally-convicted scurrilous and libellous Newspaper "The Satirist"—defends the compact for the exclusion of the doctrine of infant baptism from the Tract Society's publications, by Mr. Hinton's own argument: it is not a catholic doctrine; that is, it is sectarian. Mr. Hinton, who professes himself so zealous an admirer of Mr. O'Connell, and wishes so humbly to copy his bright example as an agitator—both having the the same avowed end in view, the extinction of our national church establishments—ought to be much obliged to his Pædobaptist Dissenting brethren of the Patriot, for lending their powerful aid to promote anabaptism, while professing only to uphold the compact of the Tract Society.

Mr. Hinton says: "For the disagreeableness of the immersionist versions of the Scriptures to the Calcutta Pædobaptists, I know of no reason but one—it is denominational rivalry." Now it is somewhat singular that the members of the Church of England—whose baptismal office expressly directs that the minister shall "dip" the child in the water, if certified that it may well endure it—should be actuated by sectarian rivalry, in determining that the Bible Society ought (as in the English version) to use the untranslated term "baptize," or some general word which does not determine the litigated question of the mode, when, if they had been influenced by "denominational" and not honest feelings, they would have coalesced with Mr. Hinton and his friends in demanding some phrase equivalent to "dip." But Mr. Hinton, it will have been observed, does not accuse his fellow-Christians of being sectarian, merely because of the mode, but also because of the subjects: the Bible Society is "the institution of a sect," not only because of the alleged "denominational rivalry" of not arbitrating on the question of "immersion;" but because it is "the *Pædobaptist* (infant baptising) Society!!"

I was glad to see that the Anabaptists (I cannot admit their claim to the title of Baptists, for that were to admit their assertion that no person in Christendom has ever been baptised, who was not baptised according to their views as an adult, and by immersion) have widely circulated Mr. Hinton's Letter to Lord Bexley under the covers of the magazines; not only because that letter incidentally shews the impar-

tial, consistent, non-sectarian character of the Bible Society, which so greatly displeases the Anabaptists; but because I trust it will open the eyes both of Pædobaptist Dissenters, and of those Churchmen who are members of the Tract Society, to the encroaching character of the sect to which Mr. Hinton belongs, and to the evil consequences of the compact so often alluded to. Mr. Hinton and his friends will not consent, in translating the Scriptures for the Bible Society, to use any word which does not convey their own view: and yet they expect that in the Tract Society all Christendom shall relinquish a most important doctrine of Christ's catholic church, in order to have their co-operation. I doubt whether the doctrine of reciprocity of concession is ever lawful, where the truth of God is concerned; but sure I am that it is not equitable that all the reciprocity should be on one side.

Observing that another correspondent, in your last Number, has happened to fall upon the same signature as myself, I will yield him the first place, and subscribe myself, DIDYMUS SECUNDUS.

LETTER FROM THE REV. C. DODGSON; WITH REMARKS IN REPLY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Sir,—I beg to thank you for your attention to my letter. In reply to your remarks upon it, you will perhaps permit me to trouble you with a very few words.

In the note numbered 6, you say: "When points of doctrine occur, our correspondent says he does not mean to discuss them: nay, he gives no opinion upon them. To what purpose then is his letter, since it was precisely upon these points that we complained of the questions?" In answer to this inquiry allow me to refer you to the following words of the letter itself: "My sole object is to remove the erroneous impressions as to *facts*, under which this review has been written, and which it is calculated to make upon others." It is on this point that I wish to make myself clearly understood.

Had your "complaint" of the Questions, amounted in substance to this—"We think this mode of examination highly improper, and the doctrines implied in it, heterodox and unscriptural,"—I should have left the Review altogether unnoticed; not from any disrespect towards your opinions, but because I do not think it necessary, nor, considering the nature of my office, proper, to enter into a public vindication of my doctrinal views, or my official proceedings, in reply to the attacks which may be made upon them. I was of course well aware that there are some who differ from me; and the Review would have proved nothing more than that its author was among the number.

But the questions which I did touch upon—for instance, whether the candidates for ordination were required to do certain things on pain of exclusion from the diocese of Ripon—were questions not of opinion but of *fact*. You had *inferred* the affirmative; I was able to demonstrate the negative; and I am at a loss to understand your meaning, when you say that my counterstatement was "wholly irrelevant," and that my letter did not "convict you of any misapprehension," as to the facts of the case.

In distinctly declining, therefore, to offer any defence, or even ex-

planation of my religious views, I would merely re-assert, *as a fact*, that my opinion, more particularly on the subjects of baptism and justification, have been misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented in the Review; and even more so in the subsequent "Notes;" and I am quite contented with putting this simple disclaimer upon record, in order that it may not be inferred that the charge is admitted because it is not contradicted.

For the same reason, I would add that it is not a fact that I uphold the Arminian as the Anglican view of Predestination and Election. Indeed I have maintained that the 17th Article approaches more nearly to the Calvinistic scheme. But I disclaim both *systems* equally, holding with the late Bishop Tomline, that "the Church of England is not Calvinistic; it is not Arminian; IT IS SCRIPTURAL."

In conclusion, let me assure you, with reference to your supposition, that this discussion, (as you term it,) may have given me pain, that it has caused me none whatever, beyond that which every man naturally feels in being represented as holding and teaching doctrines which he has never taught and never held.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Daresbury, Warrington, Aug. 23, 1838. CHARLES DODGSON.

*** Mr. Dodgson persists in charging us with misrepresenting, first, facts, and secondly, his opinions; and yet, in reply to our repeated requests to him to shew in what we have done either, he continues to repeat his "simple disclaimer" without specification. Is it right for him to bear witness before the world against his neighbour; and when his neighbour asks him to shew that the witness was true, to stand upon his privilege as examining chaplain to a bishop, and therefore to decline entering into "any defence or even explanation?" We quoted his own words respecting baptism and justification; they stand upon record; and we ask where, when, or how, we have misrepresented them? He asserts, "as a fact," that we have done so; we assert, "as a fact," that we have not; and though he brings this heavy accusation against us he declines proving it. We cannot of course prove a negative. Does he mean to deny that he has made, what Bishop Burnet most justly denominates, that "most mischievous" of Romanist doctrines, sacramental justification, the basis of his questions? In that very Note, No. 6, which he partially quotes, we went on to observe:—

"Mr. Dodgson says, that his views of baptism are 'widely different from those which the reviewer supposes.' Why not have mentioned in what we had mistaken them? This would have been the best reply to our statements; and if we were wrong, it would have been consoling to us to have been shewn our error. But in truth, we only took the questions as we found them, and presented them to our readers, suggesting a few remarks upon them; and though in an examination-room it is enough for the examiner to make a statement, yet, in the wide world, when two writers make opposite statements, readers ask for proofs; and they will not be satisfied with Mr. Dodgson's assertion that we have misinterpreted his questions without his shewing where and how we have done so."

We are unwilling to speak harshly; but certain we are, that Mr. Dodgson cannot extricate himself from the dilemma in which his questions have involved him, and that "simple disclaimer" is a more prudent course than explanation.

Our correspondent says, that if the substance of our complaint had been that "*We think this mode of examination highly improper, and the doctrines implied in it heterodox and unscriptural*," he should have left our review "altogether unnoticed." Why this, we repeated again and again, was pre-

cisely our complaint, and almost our very words. It were tedious to reprint what we stated so often; but we will quote as a specimen our opening remarks in our very first note upon his letter. We observed (p. 486):—

"Mr. Dodgson says that he will neither discuss the doctrines in the Questions, nor defend the course adopted in the examination; but will apply himself solely to remove some erroneous impressions as to facts, under which he alleges that we laboured. This being his plan, we beg leave to say, that so far as we are concerned his letter is wholly irrelevant. We have nothing whatever to do with the facts which he refers to; we never went about inquiring what passed between the bishop or his chaplain, and the candidates, in private; we did not seek to know whether any candidate had been approved, admonished, or rejected; we always wish to abstain from such personal allusions; our business is with principles; and it was in regard to principles that we considered the questions in the pamphlet which we were reviewing. *The points to which we directed our attention were, first, the doctrinal character of the questions; and, secondly, their propriety, even supposing them to be doctrinally correct;* but both these points —the ipsissimæ points of the discussion—Mr. Dodgson passes over; and proceeds to inform us respecting certain details of fact of a private and personal nature, upon which we have no wish or authority to offer any remark."

Is it then fair or candid to say that we have misrepresented facts, when we expressly abstained from discussing them? and what are we to understand by Mr. Dodgson's assertion, that he would have left our review altogether unnoticed, if our complaint had been—what in truth it actually and avowedly was?

If the real point of fact which Mr. Dodgson is anxious to make known—as well he may be, not only for his own sake, but for the sake of the Bishop of Ripon, whose deservedly high character for wisdom, candour, and sound Protestant principles, is not likely to be enhanced by his chaplain's injudicious, sectional, anti-Protestant, Oxford-tract-school questions,—is, that no candidate has actually been rejected, because he did not believe that most mischievous doctrine of sacramental justification; or could not answer that strange fourth question to priests, in which Mr. Dodgson is obliged to "confess an inadvertency;" or could not find any text of Scripture which says, that all baptized infants are justified; or "shew from a passage in St. Paul's history, that he himself was not justified until he was baptized;" or when told to "distinguish between the Calvinistic and Arminian view of Calvinism," and to prove that our articles do not affirm the former, was somewhat doubtful on the subject; if, we say, Mr. Dodgson's only object is to inform the world, that, in point of actual experience, his questions were allowed to be so stultified, that candidates who contradicted them, and who, if these questions contain the true doctrines of the church, ought not to minister within her walls, however highly qualified by learning and piety, were nevertheless not finally rejected, he needed not have troubled himself to make known this fact; for though the legitimate issue of such a series of questions is to exclude all who take directly opposite views of doctrine, as Bishop Marsh very candidly and explicitly set forth, yet sure we were, that if the matter had verged to such a result, Bishop Longley would not have countenanced the proceeding, even if his chaplain had recommended it; which we do not believe he would have done. We spoke of the obvious bearing of such questions, not of the result. That bearing is, that if you do not answer them "satisfactorily," as Bishop Marsh justly said, you do not pass the appointed ordeal; you must answer them at the risk of exclusion, if your answers are not approved. We repeatedly stated what we meant; as for instance, in note 4, at page 493; where we said:—

"On the hypothesis of 'like bishop, like chaplain,' though we did not know Mr. Dodgson's name, much less that it was he who drew up these questions, we

could not but have concluded that practically the candidates would meet with kind and anxious consideration. But we spoke of the test of doctrine as laid down in the questions, and not as it may or may not have been practically enforced; and the test of doctrine for candidates, thus ascertained, is most certainly as we have shewn it to be. The explanation stated to have been given to the young men almost turns the questions into ridicule. For instance: 'Shew from expressions in the catechism, and in the baptismal service, that our Church holds that all infants duly baptized are—1, justified; 2, sanctified: but mind, you are not expected to shew any such thing.' 'Shew from a passage in St. Paul's history, that he himself was not justified until he had been baptized:—but observe, you are at perfect liberty to say there is no such passage.' If the candidate, practically, was not expected to shew any such thing, what availed the questions?"

Mr. Dodgson says, that he should have left the review altogether unnoticed, if it had referred only to the propriety or the doctrinal character of the questions; as "he was of course aware that there are some who differ from him, and the review would have proved nothing more than that its author was among the number." Here, again, Mr. Dodgson is pleased to wrap himself up in his official mantle, and to pass by the matter very quietly. But we beg leave to remind him of a few facts. First, the reviewer spoke the general sentiment of the clergy and laity of the Church of England, as to the impropriety of such questions: has Mr. Dodgson forgotten the unanimous opinion of the House of Lords and of the public in the affair of Bishop Marsh? or did he omit to read those very appropriate remarks which we quoted from the Christian Remembrancer? Secondly, the reviewer did prove far more than the difference of opinion of an individual, for he shewed that the questions contradict the Bible and the church; and Mr. Dodgson, instead of attempting to disprove this, pleads in bar his official privilege to set forth what he pleases, and to make it the standard of clerical examination for a diocese, without being called to account for the proceeding by the general voice of the church. And, thirdly, Mr. Dodgson's own admission, that he was conscious he was propounding, not the Catholic code of the church, which all his brethren have subscribed, but one which he was well aware was grounded upon differences of opinion among its pious, well-informed, and conscientious members, incidentally proves all that we said of the sectarian and party-spirited character of these questions. Mr. Dodgson knows perfectly well, though he uses the little word "some," that the large body of those of his brethren to whom popular nomenclature has affixed the epithet "evangelical," and many who are not so designated, would feel themselves aggrieved to be obliged to subscribe to all his opinions in those questions, and the reasonings by which they are supported; and we deeply lament that Bishop Longley's much-respected and beloved name should have been mixed up with the proceeding. Why is the recently introduced Leeds School of Divinity to be the standard for the diocese?

Mr. Dodgson says, "It is not a fact that I uphold the Arminian as the Anglican view of predestination; indeed I have maintained, that the 17th Article approaches more nearly to the Calvinistic sense." This statement we confess astonishes us; for among the questions we read, "Distinguish between the Calvinistic and Arminian views of predestination. Is the former affirmed by the language of our Articles? Examine this question by considering, 1. The conduct of the Calvinistic party. What alterations and additions did they wish to introduce?" &c. &c. (See the remainder at p. 389 of our Number for June.) Can Mr. Dodgson find any one reader of these questions who inferred from them that he considered that "the Calvinistic party" were right, and not wrong, in supposing that "the 17th Article approaches more nearly to the Calvinistic sense" than to the Arminian—whatever that may be?

Mr. Dodgson says, that "the Church of England is not Calvinistic; it is not Arminian; it is Scriptural." Why that was precisely our argument: we said (page 492):—

"The very introduction officially of the words Arminian and Calvinist, as a distinction among Churchmen, at a bishop's examination of his candidates, is calculated to give rise to controversy and party-spirit. There is nothing about Calvinism and Arminianism in the Articles or Liturgy of our Church."

We must now close this discussion, unless Mr. Dodgson will so far wave what he considers his official privilege, as to state what are the doctrines which he really inculcates (if we have mistaken them), and to shew that they are borne out by Holy Scripture.

ON THE HON. AND REV. B. W. NOEL'S TRACT ON UNITY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

ALLOW me to insert, in your valuable periodical, a few remarks on part of the argument used by the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, in his tract on the Unity of the Church; premising that I fully agree with his grand principle of a steady adherence to fundamental truths, with a charitable allowance for minor errors. I do not combat this doctrine, but I object to one of his arguments for it; for we should be careful of using arguments which may be turned against the truth; and it appears to me that Mr. Noel has put one into the mouth of the Orthodox Evangelical Dissenter which might be used equally by Papists, Socinians, and infidels; for even one of the latter class may choose to say, "I have prayed earnestly to God, I have studied all the evidences of Christianity—every thing on both sides of the question; and I come with all sincerity of heart to the conclusion that the resurrection of Jesus Christ is a fable. What could I do more than I have done?"

Now, sir, suppose an infidel were to address you with this argument, what would be your reply to him? I humbly conceive to the following effect:—"I am extremely sorry to hear you reason thus, and would to God that any thing I could say might convince you of your error; but you are not responsible to my tribunal; I cannot see your heart,—doubtless if I could I should find that there was something wrong there; you will answer at the bar of him who knows all the inmost recesses of all hearts,—to him you must stand or fall; but while I believe my Bible I must hold that he who refuses to believe the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, when an opportunity of doing so is presented to him, deliberately rejects the only salvation." The same answer we should give to the Socinian, who denies Christianity virtually by denying its fundamental doctrines; for Christianity without its fundamentals is a body without a soul—a tree without its root.

I do not mean to say that there may not be individuals brought up in the errors either of Socinianism or Popery, who, from the effects of education, labour under an invincible ignorance; and when this is really the case, when the Almighty sees that they have done the very best which it was possible for them to do, under the circumstances in which they were placed, he may graciously pardon their errors, and in the next world give them that knowledge of the truth which they have not in this, and admit them to his heavenly kingdom. I am

only speaking of those who might have known the truth, but who, either through pride, prejudice, or carelessness, neglected it. In conclusion, I will remark that I have not laid down a mere hypothesis; for the above-mentioned argument of Mr. Noel has actually been made use of by infidels notorious for their pernicious writings. In proof of this I refer you to Mr. Faber's work on "the Primitive Doctrine of Election." A READER OF THE NEW SERIES OF THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

*** We received many letters respecting Mr. Noel's tract, shortly after its publication, and we more than once intended to advert to it, and particularly to the reasoning noticed in the above letter; but as we had reason to believe that the author, though he did not mention the Christian Observer, was tacitly defending the Religious Tract Society's principle against our arguments, we thought it better to leave the decision to the unbiassed judgment of others; and in truth, with so pious, zealous, affectionate, and faithful a servant of our blessed Lord as Mr. B. Noel, we had more pleasure, according to his own principle, in thinking upon the points on which we agree, than upon those on which we partly differ.

We may however, without controversy, remark, in reference to his argument, that there is a wide difference between not condemning our fellow Christians, and acting as though differences of opinion were of little moment. Mr. Noel shews that a man may be sincere, and holy, and a diligent and learned student of Scripture, and yet not see the validity of infant baptism, or the propriety of national church establishments. Most cheerfully granted; nay, not granted as though it were a concession, but responded to as a truth as dear to us as to our friend. Well then, argues Mr. Noel, such points cannot be *essential;* and this being the case, you may lawfully agree to merge them in a common effort to promote the paramount object respecting which we all agree. But here we part company: for it does not appear to us to follow, that, because a Christian has no warrant to judge his brother, he may conscientiously set light by the matters in which they differ. If he is fully convinced in his own mind, that God has revealed a certain doctrine, he cannot lawfully enter into a confederacy to do good upon the condition of suppressing it. There is a just medium between consigning other men to the uncovenanted mercies of God, and agreeing to act with them upon what we deem erroneous in their principles. The Apostle rejoiced that Christ was preached even though of envy and strife; but he would not have been willing to lend his aid to promote preaching upon this plan. We also rejoice at the good done by the Religious Tract Society; we circulate not a few of its publications; we honour the piety and zeal of its conductors; but it does not follow that we should therefore be justified in qualifying ourselves to become members of it by agreeing systematically to pretermit doctrines which we believe to be Scriptural, and silently to mutilate the writings of departed authors, so as to suppress their testimony upon points which both in their and our opinion are of great importance. Our difficulty in regard to this question is precisely the same as in regard to the selected extracts from Scripture, adopted by the Irish Board of Education, respecting which also we believe we have the unhappiness of disagreeing with Mr. Noel. There might be nothing positively to object to in a series of passages from Scripture; there *could* be nothing to object to, except they were falsified or deceitfully strung together; but we might, and do, object to the principle of forming a compact with the Church of Rome, by which nothing shall be inserted in the Scriptural extracts for popular education which a Romanist is unwilling to admit, and by sacrificing the Protestant doctrine, that the Scriptures, as a whole, ought to be used in education, and placed

in the hands of the laity. Mr. Noel appears to us to blend the refraining from uniting with those whom we consider in error with an uncharitable denouncing of them; between which there is a manifest and wide difference. A churchman may believe that his dissenting neighbour is a devout and holy man, without feeling it to be lawful for him to contribute his aid in building a dissenting chapel; just as a dissenter may think well of the clergyman of his parish, without considering it right to support a national church.

The writer who has addressed us in the above paper, has not touched Mr. Noel's argument. He represents Papists, Socinians, or infidels, as "choosing to say" that they have used every means of information without effect; and his remarks, he adds, do not touch the case of those who "labour under invincible ignorance," to whom he thinks God may give in the next world that knowledge of the truth, which they have not attained to in this. Here he represents Papists, Socinians, or infidels, and by construction "orthodox evangelical dissenters," as "choosing to say" what is not true; whereas Mr. Noel's supposition is that it was true, and that their case comes under our correspondent's second class; so that instead of his first answer to those who "refuse to believe the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, when an opportunity of doing so is presented to them," must be substituted his second; namely, that as they "labour under an invincible ignorance," God may graciously pardon their errors, and teach them in the next world what they know not in this. Thus to get out of one difficulty, do men plunge into another; for where do we read all this in the Bible? Why cannot we be content to believe that the Judge of all the earth will do right, without attempting to lay down the precise laws by which he is to regulate his decisions? Why not be satisfied with his own express declarations, Romans ii. 12—16, and elsewhere, which make the matter as plain as our finite understanding can receive it; though the ultimate question, why things are as they are, or why one man has greater privileges and means of grace than another, lies far beyond the province of human investigation. To his own master, our fellow-servant stands or falls; it is not ours to pronounce his final sentence; but still we are to act conscientiously and consistently upon our own convictions of truth; and we are not to say that anything which we believe that God has revealed is not of moment, because we know some good man who does not embrace it.

MR. FABER ON THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION AMONG THE WALDENSES.

For the Christian Observer.

Mr. Faber, in his "Inquiry into the history and theology of the ancient Vallenses and Albigenses, as exhibiting, agreeably to the promises, the perpetuity of the sincere church of Christ," states that "The possessing of an apostolic succession by the Vallenses and the Albigenses cannot be absolutely demonstrated; but it may be established sufficiently for all legitimate ecclesiastical purposes." In the course of his remarks we find the following arguments, which appear to us well worth transcription, at a time when exaggerated statements respecting the doctrine of apostolical succession are being obtruded on the church, and when attempts are made to disparage the Waldensian confessors and martyrs, whom Protestants have ever justly

regarded as honoured servants of Christ, and members of a true church, rescued from the Babylon of Papal apostacy.

"On the supposition, that the Albigenses and the Vallenses had, in their communities, no apostolic succession, either less regular, or altogether regular; which supposition, however, is incapable of evidential establishment; I should say that we have here a case directly in point to the present statement.

"From the condition of the dominant church, whether in the East, or in the West, during the long and dreary period of the middle ages, it would have been impossible for any society of serious and enlightened Christians, circumstanced as the supposition makes them to be circumstanced, to have obtained at least an episcopal transmission of the succession: nay, so far as respects the French Valdenses, two attempts, as we have seen, were actually made, without success, to obtain the Papal sanction and authority.

"How, then, by the hypothesis, would such communities be situated? Inevitably, they must remain either within the awfully predicted church of the apostacy; and thence, under the soul-destructive guidance of the 'man of sin,' partake of all its idolatrous and heretical abominations, in order that they may enjoy the privilege of an apostolical succession: or else they must relinquish the privilege of an apostolical succession, in order that they may worship God, in separate assemblies, with a pure and Scriptural worship, unstained by the idolatrous and heretical abominations of the awfully predicted church of the Apostacy.

"This is the alternative: and which part of it is to be chosen by these seven thousand men, who resolve not to bow the knee to Baal? Truly, unless I altogether mistake, the Spirit of God himself has answered the question; and has thus, still on the supposition now before us, decided in favour of the course taken by the two communities of the Vallenses and the Albigenses. 'Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven: and God hath remembered her iniquities.' To such of the Lord's people as are within the mystical Babylon, the unconditional command, we see, is to 'come out.' This command must, at all hazards, be obeyed: and when weighed against the duty of implicit obedience, every ulterior ecclesiastical consequence and every difficult and curious question which may be raised upon it, are but as dust in the balance.

"Thus, even on an extreme supposition, which yet can never be verified, I should say, that the Vallenses and the Albigenses stand fully vindicated: and thence, even according to the course of God's providential dispensation, I should say, that they stand recognised by *Himself* as two most amply commissioned churches, whose office was to prophesy in sackcloth against the degenerate votaries of a new form of Paganism."—*Faber's Vallenses and Albigenses, Book* IV. *Chap.* III. pp. 569, 570.

ON THE UNION OF EVANGELICAL PROFESSIONS WITH WORLDLY PRACTICES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

MAY I beg some of your correspondents to set forth occasionally the evil of conformity to the world. I have no doubts on the subject myself: but I have been much harassed lately by the increase of dissipation in my parish, and particularly by finding that some whom I considered hopeful members of my flock, cannot resist this subtle temptation; nay, even persons who know the truth, who are diligent in the use of the means of grace, support missions, and *profess* to love the Saviour, will go to a ball, and defend their conduct by alleging that, though some Christians condemn it, they can see no harm in it.

In fact, we are in *this* state, which is, I fear, very common; the Gospel has been long preached; our congregations generally approve and prefer it; many persons will defend evangelical preaching; and yet, on closer intimacy you find them quite worldly in their spirit and

practice. I need not say that this is distressing; it is, to my mind, *awful.*

Again, some cannot tolerate what they call Calvinism, under which name they include whatever comes too closely home to their consciences; and others have no patience with our mentioning worldly amusements in the pulpit. We may preach the gospel, but we must not be *personal.* Yes, preach the truth; preach faithfully; but the aristocracy must have their ball; the yeomen theirs; the tradesmen theirs; the political parties each theirs. And besides, we shall go to the oratorio of course, and now and then, perhaps, take our children to see a play. Alas! this is no exaggeration; it is too common a picture. Will some of your experienced correspondents, especially some of my elder brethren in the ministry, who must have long ago had to deal with these things, suggest what ought to be done under such circumstances? Thereby they may help and strengthen the hands of

A CURATE.

TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS TO THE SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

As several writers, professing to be members of the Church of England, have lately maintained that Scripture without tradition is not a sufficient guide to the doctrines of our holy faith; and as they make frequent appeals to the ancient Fathers, not merely as witnesses (which they are) but as authorities (which they are not), permit me to shew, by two or three references, what were the views of the ancient Fathers upon this very doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture.

Tertullian remarks:—

"As for Hermogenes, let his shop produce the *written* word. *If he be unable* to produce the *written word* in substantiation of his tenets, let him dread that scriptural woe which is destined to those who either add to it or detract from it." Tertull. adv. Hermog. § 12. Opera, p. 346.

Let us next hear Cyril of Jerusalem:—"Respecting the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, *not even a tittle* ought to be delivered *without the authority* of the holy Scriptures.....the security of our faith depends.....upon demonstration from the holy Scriptures." Cyril. Catech. iv. p. 80.

Let us next hear Athanasius:—"The holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures are SUFFICIENT for the declaration of the truth."

See also Cyprian, Epist. lxxiv. Opera, vol. ii. p. 211.

See also Athanasius de Incarn. Christi. Opera, vol. i., p. 484, and Athanas. de S. Trin. dial. ii. Opera, vol. ii. p. 172.

The Oxford Tract writers must surely consider the best works which have been written on fundamental doctrines mere useless lumber; for instance, "the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity" proved exclusively—and, as we always thought, most satisfactorily—from the holy Scripture, by the Rev. W. Jones, of Nayland; for these writers determine—contrary to the opinions of Cyril, Athanasius, &c.—that the holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures are *not* sufficient for the declaration of sacred truth.

CIVIS.

ON THE SUNDAY INSTRUCTION OF FAMILIES.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

You would confer a substantial favour, not only upon your present correspondent, but, I am inclined to think, upon many others of your readers, if you would either yourself give some hints and directions for the pleasant and profitable instruction of families, more particularly on Sundays; or furnish an opportunity for some of your correspondents to do so. I am the master of a family, and have daily morning and evening worship, with reading of the Holy Scriptures. On Sundays all my servants attend church once, and the greater part of them twice. Still there is a large portion of the day at liberty for domestic instruction; a duty incumbent, I think, on the master of a family, notwithstanding the multiplied opportunities for public worship; a duty, however, not less difficult than necessary. The special difficulty which I find, consists in the adopting such a mode of instruction, as, by its varying from the ordinary routine, may interest and engage the attention. It should differ from the simple reading of Scripture, which is pursued regularly every day; and the reading of a sermon, after two have been heard at church, is apt to weary by its sameness, as well as to confuse—or rather perhaps to surfeit—by an over-supply of the same kind of food. I find also a dearth of sermons adapted for family reading. The style of most is too inverted, and the language too classical to be generally intelligible. I have thought of a course of Ecclesiastical history. But where is a suitable one to be met with? Milner's is too long for such a purpose; and its style is, moreover, better adapted for the educated than for the illiterate. Burton's is a neat summary of a short period of Church history; but is obscure in style and language.

But without stating further objections, I will only repeat my request to be furnished either with the names of some books well-adapted to the purpose; or with some hints for the pursuit of a plan which may at once interest and profit an assembled family. Any catechetical system, I would beg leave to add, is, I think, impracticable. Grown up men and women, naturally enough, feel great shyness in asking or answering questions in the presence of others. Still if you, or any of your friends, have found this plan to *answer*, I should be thankful for a detail of hints as to the best mode of conducting it.

Q. S. M.

*** Has our correspondent ever tried the plan of taking the Epistle or Gospel for the day; carefully and devoutly meditating upon it in private, with the aid of sermon-writers or commentators, till the chief points in it present themselves strongly to his mind and heart, as likely, by the Divine blessing, to interest and profit his family, if opened and enforced in a natural, affectionate, serious, yet conversational manner, as they have impressed himself? Church history is far too cold, secular, and unspiritual, for Sunday family devotion; but Scripture furnishes ample scope for edifying and striking remark suited for household instruction. We of course do not mean to discard or disparage sermons or commentaries; but when servants or children are going to sleep under them, they may perhaps be aroused by being addressed in a less formal manner, with an affectionate interest, which opens an avenue at once to the heart. Devout narratives (not fictitious) may often be used with good effect.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BISHOP BOWEN'S FUNERAL SERMON FOR BISHOP WHITE.

God's great Goodness to his Church a Call to Gratitude and Fidelity. A Sermon occasioned by the Death of the Right Rev. William White, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania: Senior and Presiding Bishop, &c. Delivered in St. Michael's Church, Charleston, United States, by NATHANIEL BOWEN, D.D., Rector and Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina.

WE gave, from various materials in our possession, so copious a memoir of the late Bishop White, long the father of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, with such copious extracts from some of the sermons preached upon occasion of his death, that we will not repeat the general incidents of the narrative; or recapitulate the circumstances, interesting as they are, of the rise and progress of that church with which his name is indissolubly connected. But the discourse of Bishop Bowen happening to be in our hands, and furnishing some memoranda which we have not particularly adverted to, we will add, even thus late, a sequel to our former papers. Of the original Bishops of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, Bishop Seabury, who was consecrated in Scotland in 1784, died in 1796; Bishop Prevost, who was consecrated in England together with Bishop White in 1787, died in 1815; Bishop Madison, whose date of consecration is uncertain, died in 1812; while the patriarchal Bishop White was spared to a very old age, and was taken to his heavenly rest in 1836.

Dr. White, as is observed by the venerable and truly episcopal author of the excellent and appropriate discourse in our hands (from Ps. cxxvi. 3), was "not to be exclusively appropriated by any community, civil or religious; his life and character made him the property of the Christian and civilized world. Where the claims of humanity and religion distinctly required it, he was of no family but that of man, of no name but that of Christ." The sermon, in like manner, recording his conduct and character, must be considered as no exclusive property of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina, but as detailing operations, and enforcing principles, of influence and importance throughout the world. We may advance so far as to say, that the church itself, in which both these excellent men have borne so distinguished a part (and may Bishop Bowen long survive in the maintenance of his own valuable labours), is not to be regarded as a church in a corner in a remote hemisphere; but a constitutional part of our favoured Christendom, a substantial wing in the building which stands on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.

The American Episcopal Church, as a distinct community, had its origin in the separation of the Colonies from the mother country, and the declaration of American independence. Till that period our English church had most unwisely and inefficiently attempted to govern the ecclesiatical affairs of the whole Western hemisphere, as likewise of the Eastern world,

in so far as our possessions were concerned; and the duties and privileges of the Episcopal functions were to be exercised by the single arm of the Bishop of London. In comparison, we might almost congratulate that functionary, should he have only (only!) to wield episcopal authority over about a million and half of population in the new Diocese of London, with the Tower Hamlets and Southwark adjoined, to suit the proposed Parliamentary arrangements.

Under such circumstances episcopal authority was not more likely to be well and effectively administered in our Protestant American Colonies, than civil authority. Yet it is true the remedy would have been easier in the Church than in the State. An independent government was scarcely to have been devised, without the separation of the countries, which speedily ensued upon a political collision. The establishment of an independent Episcopacy, on the other hand, would at once have served the purposes of Episcopal government and Apostolical discipline, which must have only been a name without it; and also might have contributed to cement those countries, and have prevented their disruption altogether; as it even now seems to draw into a healing union the lips of the gaping wound between them.

It is scarcely, perhaps, possible to imagine a more interesting intellectual and moral struggle in the breast of civilised and evangelised humanity, than that which must have taken place in the breasts of many faithful and attached members of the English Episcopal communion in America, on the occasion above alluded to. It is very significantly and graphically described in this sermon, both from the pen of Bishop Bowen, and, in a note, from the auto-biography of Bishop White himself. We may give both, as a specimen of the opinions and feelings of these "concordes animæ" of American growth: and both shew the "anima verè Christiana." Bishop Bowen says:

"When not yet thirty years of age, or about twenty-seven, he found the contest of the revolution had been already some time in process; and it must have been no easy task so to carry himself, in a sphere like that into which he was called, as not to offend by the compromise, or else by the unaccommodated maintenance, of his individual political sentiments, and the position in which they placed him. Times which admitted of no neutrality, could not but deny it with a peculiar severity to the ministers of religion; who, deriving their authority from the church of the parent country, exercised their office under its auspices and laws. In them it was imperative to be declared and known, without equivocation or disguise, as the friends or enemies of the revolt, forced on the colonies. Very many of them, sympathising with the abused and suffering country where their lot had been cast, still could not waive what they conceived to be the paramount obligation of allegiance to the government to which, as its true subjects, they had looked with reverence and affection; and when the only alternative which circumstances admitted was, whether they would continue British subjects, or embark with the colonies in this struggle for independance, with a painful, however conscientious, devotedness of loyalism, relinquished their employments, with all the satisfaction attached to them, and committed themselves to the doubtful sufficiency of the protection and provision for which the government authorised them to look. *By far the greater number of clergymen retired as loyalists.* Of the few who remained, Mr. White was one of the most conspicuous in character and station. Severe trials of personal sensibility became his lot. Resources like his could not be unequal to them. Although the greater number of church members favoured the Revolution, he had about him enemies of the cause which he had espoused.

"Before them he stood in all the conscientious discharge of his ministry; and by the gentleness and purity of his conduct, mixed with a firmness which none could but respect, and a fidelity none could gainsay, he was throughout the beloved and admired pastor of them all. Through all these trying circum-

stances we have ground to believe no man became personally his enemy; or, whether in the ministry or of the laity, exhibited towards him any feelings but those of complacency, confidence, and regard. The amenity of his own deportment towards all; the frankness and simplicity with which he expressed his sentiments; the mild inoffensiveness, yet ability and firmness, with which he maintained them; and above all the devoted constancy and piety, the meek yet dignified consistency with which he exhibited his ministry—all combined to cause him to be esteemed and honoured, in a singular degree, among all descriptions of men."

The exhibition of the same struggle given from the recesses of Bishop White's own bosom, in the course of the auto-biography, will add much to the interest of the foregoing.

"Perhaps, had the issue depended upon my determination, it would have been for submission, with the determined and steady continuation of rightful claim. But, when my countrymen in general had chosen the dreadful measure of resistance—for certainly that spirit was almost universal at the time of arming—it was the dictate of conscience to take what seemed the right side. When matters were verging to independence, there was less to be said for dissent from the voice of the country, than in the beginning. Great Britian had not relinquished a particle of her claim. Her commissioners did not pretend any power of this sort from the crown; and had they pretended it, there was no power in the crown to suspend Acts of Parliament, or to promise a repeal of them. On this ground it must be perceived that the least defensible persons were they who gave their services to the engaging in the war, and then abandoned the cause. In proof of the fact of the almost universal disposition of the Americans, you may be referred to Bisset's History of the Reign of George the Third, written in opposition to the anti-government history of Belsham. It will not be unprofitable to you to bestow your serious attention on the details made by the former—not merely of the injustice of ministerial measures, but of the folly of them—indicative of utter ignorance of our country, and of subsequent incapacity for the governing of it. Government confided for information on the persons whom they ought most of all to have distrusted, and repeated failure did not cure them of the delusion till the effect was irremediable.

"Although possessed of these sentiments, I never beat the ecclesiastical drum. My two brethren in the assistant ministry preached before battalions animating sermons, approbatory of the war, which were printed; as did the most eminent of our clergy. Dr. Smith, our aged Rector, in consequence of increasing weakness, was retiring from the world. Not long before this time he resigned his Rectorship, was succeeded by Mr. Duché, and soon after died. Being invited to preach before a battalion, I declined; and mentioned to the colonel, who was one of the warmest spirits of the day, my objections to making the ministry influential to the war. I continued, as did all of us, to pray for the king until the Sunday (inclusive) before the 4th of July 1776. Within a short time after, I took the oath of allegiance to the United States, and have since remained faithful to it. My intentions were upright, and most seriously weighed. I hope they were not in contrariety to my duty."

The difficulties necessarily arising out of this crisis of church affairs must have been embarrassing and threatening beyond measure to the whole church system in the new states. The parties, in fact, bore a strong resemblance to our own great religious divisions at the Revolution in 1688. There were the "non-juring" American loyalists; the large body of "Dissenters" from the old episcopal church; and the new constitutional Episcopalians. The latter were opposed by the two former. The Dissenters were always glad to use their influence with the ruling powers to check any new episcopacy in the bud. Nor was the case, for a *constitutional* episcopacy, at all benefited by the consecration of Bishop Seabury in 1784, from the Scottish episcopacy, as the head of the *non-juring* party in America. The parent government in England, under all circumstances, found great difficulties in sanctioning any similar appointment: and it was left for Bishop White, by the force of his character and prudence—in conjunction, we ought

to add, with our Granville Sharp, who chiefly managed the business in England—to effect that important but delicate task, the final erection of a general Protestant Episcopal Church for the new American republic. Of Bishop White's share in the transaction, Bishop Bowen says :—

"Without him, as personally the head and front of the proceedings, it is doubtful whether it would for years have been found practicable to effect it. Before his name all opposition, once so loud and clamorous, disappeared. He consented to be elected Bishop of the Churches in Pennsylvania, and the wise selection of another for those of New York, and of a third for Virginia, gave completeness to the plan adopted for the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. From that period we date the rise of this church to the honourable position it has held in Protestant Christendom. From that period the number of its clergy began to be renewed with a character suited to the new constitution of the civil state, and all things to go happily forward towards the prosperity and strength in which we now see it throughout our extensive country. It is impossible to look back upon the path of its progress, since the peace of 1783, and not see, in the prominent instrumentality of Bishop White, 'the Lord doing great things for us,' and demanding our fervent gratitude and religious joy."

Bishop White seems to have been raised up, by the infinitely wise providence of God, for the settlement of an apostolical episcopacy in America, much as Bishop Middleton was for the same purpose in India. The advantage, not of learning or of great intellectual powers, but of peculiar suavity of temper, and general calmness of mind, lay perhaps with Bishop White; and enabled him, during a long life, to sustain with little attrition the often rough friction of untoward events, and to witness the rich fruits of a vigorous and flourishing branch of the true apostolical church, which is now extending itself over the whole American Union, and adding not only large bodies of clergymen and laymen to its ranks, but new bishops and dioceses, as the stream of population flows forward.

"To the zeal of his Christian benevolence, and the excellence of his practical wisdom, we are well authorised, under providence, to attribute, in a principal degree, results of the kind to which I have referred; and which made of Protestant Episcopalians, from one to the other extremity of the first thirteen states of the American Union, a well compacted body of brethren, having one rule of religious faith, discipline, and of worship, most happily in all things joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

The happily Christian and truly primitive arrangement of gaining over, or admitting, of Bishop Seabury, the real proto-bishop of the United States by three years—that *is*, the junction of the *non-juring* and the *constitutional* episcopacy into one "compacted body of brethren," was the masterstroke of Bishop White's wise and well-directed labours.

"It was he who distinguishingly asserted and maintained the claim of the respectable Bishop of Connecticut and his clergy, to be received to a full participation with himself and others in the transactions of the church, and thus harmonized every thing."

His conduct with the "dissenting" classes, is not so clearly defined by Bishop Bowen, though it was broadly marked.

"He was at once too wise, too generous, and too candid, not to admit the *perfect honesty* of heart with which other men might come to conclusions, on questions of *religion* and of *government*, the most opposite to his own; and, while acting on deep conviction of the soundness and importance of the views he had been led himself to form, hesitated not to admit the moral integrity of any who might the most utterly refuse him their sympathy in entertaining them. Hence, with respect to those who were in their sentiments adverse to the mode of Christianity, which he had been led by education, habit, and inquiry, decidedly to prefer, his course was universally unoffending, respectful, and kind."

As the excellent author of this sermon means neither more nor less than he says, we presume

him to say, that Bishop White admitted the perfect honesty and moral integrity of even heretical sects, in so far as to give their members no offence, nor withhold from them a respectful and kind demeanour. His conduct in this case we can better understand and appreciate, than the admission on which it is founded—namely, the perfect honesty and moral integrity of all, and several, the parties and sects so dealt with. We do not see how it would be possible to deny the same admission, even to those whose habits of thought, and action and education, lead them utterly to deny the evidences as well as the doctrines of Christianity; or to follow any phantom whatever of superstition, impiety, and idolatry. There must be a limit to such admissions somewhere; to kindly and respectful demeanour nowhere: and in these matters we cannot but in conscience and feeling admit that we have somewhat to learn from our transatlantic church brethren.

It is gratifying to subjoin, to any latitudinarian appearances in the foregoing statement, Bishop Bowen's exposition of his Right Reverend brother's fundamental and heartfelt creed.

"We are not willing to ascribe any [welfare of our institutions] to him, but as the faithful minister of Jesus Christ, according to his doctrine scripturally entertained, and of his church primitively constituted. He was, from the beginning of his course, the pious and faithful minister of grace to men, through the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the communion and fellowship of the church which He had 'purchased with his blood.' The testimony is in our possession of the perfectness with which he held the doctrine of Redemption by the death and sacrifice of Christ, 'through faith that is in him,' and the sanctification of the Spirit unto the obedience of his word."

Again exhibiting this venerable man as an example to the clergy, and taking occasion to exhort them from his tomb, Bishop Bowen adds:—

"They know finally, and above all, how near his heart he held the great truth of Jesus Christ, and him crucified; and how in all his life and doctrine he set forth its constraining power, and its claim of all men to be received as a faithful saying, never to be lost from their regard, or postponed in their thoughts to any thing bearing the name or pretension of religious truth; and how *in death he felt its sustaining influence*, when heart and flesh were failing him."

We here, then, take our leave of Bishop White, and his faithful and single-minded panegyrist. Bishop Bowen was not unknown to us at the period of his visit to this country; and he has left many a pleasing recollection behind him, of his simple unassuming manners; of his solid acquirements in theology, and also in the general standard literature of this country; of the homage of his understanding to the ecclesiastical system of this country, as embodied in many individuals among its illustrious ornaments and supports; and of the testimony of his heart to many responding sentiments of Christian friendship, formed and cherished in his company, and not forgotten in his absence.

The mutual approbation, respect, and affection of good and Christian men, which, always affording the pleasantest seasoning of this ever mingled cup of earthly existence, loses nothing of its savour, when established between the cordial members and leading dignitaries of distant kindred churches. The intercourse of members of the American Protestant Episcopacy with this country, has seemed to us one of the many pleasing harbingers of some approaching general agreement of the assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven. The speedy birth in America of a uniting Christian Episcopacy, upon the past events of a separating political

revolution, cannot, at least, but afford a happy omen for good to the two countries in times to come: nor can we altogether lose the notion, that if such a creation had previously taken place, and only reasonable and Christian precautions had been taken to establish an intercommunity of interest and piety between the English inhabitants of the two hemispheres, something better than their separation and nominal independence might have been the result.

As it is, we see a very great affinity between the Episcopal relations of our ancient Colonists, and all the best and most cherished feelings of our far more ancient and apostolical Anglican Church. Nay, we go further, and say that there is something even in the forms of *civil* polity which draws them towards each other, where Episcopacy, genuine and influential, like that of the United States, is found to prevail. Neither the wildness of democracy, nor the assumptions of tyranny, are congenial with the simple, limited, monarchical spirit of a primitive subordinated Episcopacy. Rights of every salutary kind are mutually conceded and upheld; and opinions, without being arbitrarily assumed or enforced, are made, by general conventional arrangements, to take the authority of mild and equal laws.

Such establishments become mutual examples and encouragements to each other. We believe that the American Episcopacy is fast learning the necessity, and establishing the principle, and exhibiting the practice, of a modified Church Endowment, vested both in Episcopates, and in parochial and district ministrations: and herein we are very far from denying that we have something to learn, or *re-learn*, from our faithful and manly progeny of the American Episcopacy. Their annual Diocesan Conventions, with their Triennial Convocations of the whole Episcopal Church in their several representatives, are points of ancient discipline, which we may well consider the propriety of reviving, under due modification, after their example. At the same time, our position as a national establishment interposes peculiar difficulties under present circumstances, which we cannot be so blind as to overlook, or so sanguine as to say we account of small magnitude. It has been remarked by a learned and acute Dissenter, that the revival of Convocation might perhaps purify our church as a spiritual communion, but would seal its fate as a national establishment. If we were as certain of the former effect as we are of the latter, we could not in conscience hesitate as to the propriety of the measure, come what would of it. At all events, the almost unanimous opinion of our Prelates is so strongly opposed to the revival of ecclesiastical synods—though a little shaken by recent events—that we feel it our duty to suspend our judgment till we have fuller evidence than at present presents itself to our minds in favour of the proposition.

We have so often alluded to, and quoted from, Bishop White's able and dignified addresses, delivered at the diocesan and general conventions of his church, that we will not protract this sequel of a review by recurring to them, though they are now before us. Nor need we add any further notices or remarks to those already offered, to make the whole subject of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, both before and after their struggles, to appear a case very strongly in point to our present church proceedings in Canada; and perhaps to the future destinies of that colony, for generations yet unborn.

REVIEW OF A LAYMAN'S ESSAYS ON THE CHURCH.

Essays on the Church. By a Layman. A new edition; with some Observations on Existing Circumstances and Dangers. 1838.

We have more than once noticed, though we have never reviewed, this very seasonable, able, and extensively-circulated work; but we took up the present enlarged and improved edition, chiefly to see what are the "existing circumstances and dangers" which call forth the special remarks and monitions of the author; and as those of our readers who possess earlier editions of the work may wish to possess a portion of these valuable addenda (while to others the whole will be new), we will give as ample a specimen as our limits allow. In former editions of his work, the layman (who now, that the marked favour of the friends of the church has crowned his labours, still modestly withholds his name, as he did while his essays were an experiment), set forth with much cogency of argument, and appropriate adduction of fact, the nature of national church establishments, their scriptural sanction, their expediency and utility, and the duty of rulers to support them; and replied to the arguments for the voluntary principle, and shewed its practical working; adding much important discussion relative to the church itself, its ritual, its discipline, its endowments, its excellencies, its defects, and the means of supplying them. We will not venture to set our foot upon this vast field, but will confine our attention to that large portion of the new matter which relates to what the author justly considers a most ominous danger to the church at the present moment. The attacks of dissent, though increased in virulence, are becoming more impotent in operation; for the great mass of the people of Great Britain have rejected, with the strongest disapprobation, that monstrous doctrine of dissent that a nation must begin by renouncing religion in its public capacity, in order that its members may be religious as individuals; that we must revert to atheism, in order that we may be Christians; that hundreds of thousands and millions of people in our parishes ought to be deprived of the means of grace, and the hopes of salvation, in order that some volunteer may set up a chapel, and collect and keep up a congregation of a fraction of the better-disposed part of the inhabitants, who to good disposition unite the ability to pay pew rent, while the vast majority are left ignorant and unbefriended. Against such a system as this the great mass of all that is wise, and enlightened, and Christian, and moral, in the land, has unequivocally raised its voice; leaving the little knot of political dissenters who espouse it to find their allies among Socinians and Infidels; with agitating Papists, who join in a time-serving campaign against church establishments in Great Britain and Ireland, because Popery is not established; and radicals and revolutionists who are perfectly sincere in their opposition. Dissent, which was to have done so much in parliament, by the abolition of all national support to the church by poor-rates, or otherwise, has signally failed in its efforts; and in proportion as the storm of persecution has become keen, the people of England and Scotland, and the right-minded in Ireland also, have rallied around their beloved institutions; while dissent, which once appeared respectable, as contend-

ing for religious privileges, has now identified itself with party-strifes and secular ambition, and exposed itself to just opprobrium. The modern dissenters turn their backs with scorn upon the narrow-minded prejudices of a Baxter, a Henry, or a Howe; but in so doing they relinquish what constituted in public opinion their strongest claims to respect, and must consent to be regarded with not a little of the disrepute attached to the projectors of the French Revolution, who in abolishing, not merely Popery, but all national recognition of Christianity, did only what modern dissenters say is doing God and man service. The people of these realms, with such exceptions as those above-mentioned, justly reprobate—we repeat it—these unhallowed doctrines; and not a little of the zeal which has been so laudably evinced in building churches and supporting religious institutions, in connexion with our national Zion, may be traced to the re-action of those very principles which were intended to raze its walls; those who loved it loving it the better in its hour of persecution, and many who thought little of it being induced to consider its claims upon their regard in consequence of the attacks made upon it.

We believe that the moral strength of dissent is far less than it was when the first edition of this work was published; but a new—we hope only a temporary—danger has since grown up in the bosom of the church itself, which the writer too truly describes as one of alarming import; he alludes to the peculiar opinions set forth in the Oxford Tracts. We have already noticed many faithful and seasonable remonstrances against these insidious tenets, and intend to notice several others which have since reached us, but we have seen none more explicit and deserving of serious consideration than those of the Layman, the substance of whose statements we proceed to transcribe; as he has presented them under fourteen different heads:—

"No one who takes a rapid glance at the state and prospects of the Church of England, some sixty or eighty years back, and compares them with its present condition, can avoid seeing that a vast, and deep, and all important change has taken place in the course of that period.

"When we look back upon the state of things in England during the greater part of the eighteenth century, we cannot avoid seeing, in the active and virulent persecution which the preachers of the gospel met with, especially from many of the clergy, that the church's enemy had, even in the very precincts of the church itself, no inconsiderable or inactive body of partisans, during the greater part of that period.

"But when we change our view, and contemplate the circumstances of the present moment, how vast, how total almost, does the alteration seem! The warfare which raged so long and so vehemently, is over; scarcely a slumbering ember is to be discerned; and although among individuals the same enmity and alienation doubtless exists; yet, looking to the surface of things, to that which is open and cognizable, we may almost venture to say, that the war between 'orthodox' and 'evangelical' is ended, and that a perfect peace reigns throughout the church.

"We must certainly be prepared to admit, that something has been lost, as well as gained, in the course of the changes, unions, and pacifications, which have marked the progress of the last ten years in the Church's history.

"The first advantage, then, which, as it appears to us, the enemy obtained, in that fusion of the two parties in the church which has lately taken place, was a considerable, though almost imperceptible, reduction of the doctrinal standard previously maintained among the Evangelical clergy. Thus far, a clear gain accrued to the church's enemy; but this advance was immediately followed by a new and most adroit manœuvre, calculated to create an alarm in another direction, wholly apart from all doctrinal questions; which was effected by instigating the dissenters to assail the Establishment with the most thorough and determined hostility. Most eagerly, and almost

with one consent, did our dissenting brethren fall into this snare, and execute this part of the tempter's plan. And here, too, we saw another important change, and another token that the character of the enemy's operations was entirely altered. The principles of Watts and Henry, of Baxter and Owen, were thrown to the winds; and the dissenters rushed into an exterminating warfare with an Establishment which their fathers had, for more than a century, owned as a national blessing!

"This movement hastened the union of parties in the church, and prepared the way for the latest and most subtle of all the tempter's approaches. United in one common bond by the common danger, and exasperated against their dissenting brethren by this unprovoked attack, the moment was most opportune for the suggestion of the necessity of a higher tone of churchmanship, and a clearer understanding of the true position and rights of the church.

"It may be said that the suggestion was just and good; and this may in some sense be true. The tempter is always ready to adduce even scriptural truths at the wrong moment, and for a wrong end. (Matthew iv. 6.) In the present case he has clearly a double object in view,—the introduction of a modified system of Popery into the Church; and the prevention of a vast influx of dissenters into its communion,—a circumstance which had become highly probable.... The crafty foe has so contrived matters, that just at the moment when thousands of dissenters were prepared to join the church of Scott and Milner and Newton, they are repelled by a demand that they shall go far beyond this, and submit to all the follies of Laud, and even to worse follies than Laud ever dreamed of!

"Can there be a doubt as to the real origin of this suggestion? Multitudes, heretofore alienated, offer to confess their belief, that Episcopacy is, on the whole, both scriptural and desirable. But they are told that this is nothing, except they also admit, that presbyterian ordination is invalid, and that the church of Scotland has not the sacraments! They are ready to give up their scruples about the language of our baptismal service; when they are immediately warned, that in the church, Baptism is held to be the only New Birth, and that for sin after baptism there is scarcely a place left for repentance! They are ready to admit the propriety and beauty of our church festivals; and it is instantly demanded of them, to pay divine honours to the Virgin and the saints! Is it possible to doubt, that in thus finding out new matter for dissension, when a great reunion of our separated brethren seemed at hand, the activity and subtilty of the church's great enemy is clearly to be discerned.

"The impulse seems to be two-fold; partly resentful towards the dissenters, and shewing itself in attempts to cut those off from all catholic fellowship, who, a few years back, were acknowledged to be 'fellow-labourers, and 'heirs together of the grace of life;'—and partly defensive; leading men, under apprehensions of the loss of the support of the State, to look out for some higher authority than that of human legislatures, on which to rest their title to the appellation of 'the Church.'

"Here, again, the enemy took advantage of the principles which were in themselves just and true; pushing them, however, to extremes, and applying them to his own purposes. And thus has arisen the present system of high churchmanship. Half a century back, men would have thought it utterly impossible that in a few short years a system could grow up within the Church of England, so closely approximating to Romanism. Yet this is actually occurring before our eyes; and a brief three or four years has sufficed to develope a perfect system of modified Popery; not professed by two or three isolated individuals merely, but extensively maintained and taught throughout the empire.

"We have termed it 'modified Popery;' and it is nothing short of this. But this is a grave accusation, and we must establish it by proof, before we proceed another step.

"Popery, entire and unmitigated, could not grow up within the pale of our Established Church. Were a company of Jesuits of the most fiery and vehement character, to be especially let loose upon us, for the purpose of seducing back again into Popery the Church of England (and no man can say that such a mission may not be actually at work among us), they would not venture to counsel, they would not even wish, that those upon whose minds they had succeeded in making a favourable impression, should at once avow their conversion, and boldly secede from the Church of England. Far more subtle and dangerous would be their course of operation; namely, to instruct their proselytes to remain within the pale of the Church, but while so preserving their rank and influence, to teach, inculcate, and defend, as large a portion of the tenets of Rome as could with safety be avowed. Any other plan than this would lead to nothing more than

the bare loss of a certain number of members to the church, counteracted by increased vigilance on the part of those who remained faithful. Such a proceeding, therefore, would be adverse to the whole system of Jesuitism, and would certainly not be the one prescribed by that undermining body.

"Or, putting the Jesuits entirely out of view; and supposing only a fresh effort of Satan to draw the Church of England back again into the hands of Antichrist; what would be the most obviously probable course which such a temptation would take? Would it not follow in the old track, and bring in Popery now, as it was brought in of old, by little and little? And is not this the very course which things are at present actually taking?

"Popery in the mass could not be at once introduced into the bosom of the English Church. So violent an invasion would only lead to as violent an ejection. But it is really amazing to observe how very large a proportion of the whole has already been introduced, and is now openly defended and inculcated. Let us take a rapid glance at the facts.

"1. The name of Protestant, then, let it be remarked, is, by the writers to whom we are adverting, constantly and vehemently abjured. This is seen in a hundred places, both in the Tracts for the Times, in the British Magazine, and in other writings of the same school. The English Church is indeed admitted to be a Reformed church; but the more favourite denomination is 'the Anglican Church,' or 'the Catholic Church.'

"'Such again, is the mischievous error in which the church in her formal documents certainly has no share, that we are but one among many Protestant bodies, and that the differences between Protestants are of little consequence; whereas the English church, as such, is not Protestant, only politically, that is, externally, or so far as it has been made an establishment, and subject to national and foreign influences. It claims to be merely Reformed, not Protestant,' &c. (Tracts for the Times, No. 71, p. 32.)

"'To hurry men down the steep descent of ultra-Protestantism to its uniform end;—the denial of the Lord who bought them.' (Ibid. No. 77, p. 36.)

"'The very name of Protestantism, cold, and negative, and sceptical as it is, ought to be abolished among us.' (Quarterly Review, vol. 61, p. 235.)

"'That odious Protestantism.' 'I am more and more indignant at the Protestant doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist.' 'I do believe R—— hates the meagreness of Protestantism as much as either of us.' 'You seem cramped by Protestantism.' (Froude's Remains, vol. i. pp. 322, 391, 404, 425.—Mr. Froude was a contibutor to the Tracts for the Times, and to the Lyra Apostolica; and the author of various papers in the British Magazine and the British Critic. His 'Remains' have been published by his coadjutors, who describe him as 'devoting himself to the promotion of one great cause:' and justify the publication on the score of 'the trnth and extreme importance of the views' therein developed.)

"2. The church of Rome is openly declared to be an object of reverence and of affection. For instance:—

"'O Mother church of Rome, why has thy heart
Beat so untruly to thy northern child?'
—(Lyra Apostolica, p. 229.)

"'To honour the Roman church and the Roman bishops, for example, without countenancing the errors of Popery, is a perplexing problem.' (British Critic, Jan. 1838, p. 233.)

"'But is it then a duty to forget that Rome was our mother, through whom we were born to Christ?' (Tracts for the Times, No. 77, p. 33.)

"3. The Reformation, every where but in England, is spoken of as a positive evil, a deep misfortune! To wit,

"'The perverse anti-ecclesiastical spirit, to which the Reformation on the Continent gave birth.' (British Mag., vol. ix. p. 359.)

"'Then many a schism overleaped the banks;
Genevese, Lutheran, Scotch diversities.'
—(Ibid. vol. ix. p. 31.)

"'As to the Reformers, I think worse and worse of them.'—'Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more.'—'The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted.' (Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 379, 389, 433.)

"4. Scotland, at the present day, is likened to Samaria, and even to Israel, when wholly given up to the worship of Baal: and a hope is expressed, that as Elijah was told, when he thought himself the only worshipper of Jehovah, that the Lord had many other hidden ones; so, in Scotland, a secret work may be going on, in spite of the apparent national apostacy!

"'Oh, rail not at our brethren of the north,
Albeit Samaria finds her likeness there;
A self-formed priesthood, and the church cast forth
To the chill mountain air.

What though their fathers sinned, and lost the grace
Which seals the holy Apostolic line,
Christ's love o'erflows the bounds his Prophets trace
In his revealed design.
Israel had seers;—to them the word is nigh;
Shall not that word run forth, and gladness give,
To many a Shunamite,—till in his eye
The full seven thousand live?'
—(Lyra Apostolica, p. 136.)

"5. Incredible as it may appear, one of the greatest disturbers of mankind that the world ever saw,—Hildebrand, who kept the Emperor Henry waiting, barefoot, three days in his court yard, is described as 'that celebrated man, who reigns in the church without the vestige of a rival.' (British Mag. vol. ix. p. 359.) It is supposed, that 'to ask that a mind like Hildebrand's should be given to the Church,' would be too great a favour; but, on such a supposition, it is added, 'The first business, then, of our Hildebrand, will be to stop this,' &c. (Ibid. vol. ix. p. 365.)

"6. Tradition is made an essential part of the rule of faith: for instance:—

"'We may say, 'The Bible and nothing but the Bible,' but this is an unthankful reception of another great gift, equally from God, such as no true Englishman can tolerate. If, on the other hand, we proceed to take the sounder view, that the Bible is the record of necessary truth, or of matters of faith, and the church Catholic's tradition is the interpreter of it, then we are,' &c. (Tracts for the Times, No. 71, p. 8.)

"7. The rule of faith is also, in some measure, to be found in the decision of a General Council.

"'If it were possible that the Catholic Church could, in the highest and exactest sense, meet in a Catholic Council, we should receive its sentence as Infallible truth. In proportion, then, as a 'general council' realises this idea, we hold its decisions in reverence.' (British Mag. vol. xii. p. 254.)

"8. Monachism and the celibacy of the clergy are declared to be necessary.

"'You must have dissent or monachism in a Christian country: so make your choice.' (British Mag. vol. ix. p. 366.)

"'Great towns will never be evangelized merely by the parochial system; they are beyond the sphere of the parish priest, burdened as he is with the endearments and anxieties of a family.' (British Mag. vol. ix. p. 368.)

"'It has lately come into my head, that the present state of things, in England, makes an opening for reviving the monastic system.' (Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 322.)

"9. Transubstantiation—that vital point upon which Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer went to the stake—evidently has no great evil in their eyes. Already are they exchanging the language of the Church of England for that of the Church of Rome. The rubric in our book of Common Prayer, constantly, (no fewer than ten times,) speaks of 'the Lord's Table,' and 'the Table:' but with these writers it is always 'the Altar.' And four times does the same rubric denominate the elements, after consecration, 'the bread,' or 'the bread and wine;' whereas these writers constantly assert them to be 'the body and blood of Christ.'

"'I should like to know, why you flinch from saying, that the power of making the body and blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles.' (Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 326.)

"'Can any devout man reckon it a matter of small moment, whether the minister, with whom he communicates, be a minister by apostolical succession or no? In the judgment of the Church it makes no less difference than this: whether the bread and cup which he partakes of, shall be to him Christ's body and blood, or no!' (Tracts for the Times, No. 52, p. 7.)

"'I verily believe, that he would now gladly consent to see our Communion Service replaced by a good translation of the Liturgy of St. Peter; a name which I wish you to substitute for the obnoxious phrase, "Mass Book." (Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 387.)

"10. The Virgin is to be honoured as something more than human; is raised, in fact, to the rank of an intercessor in heaven.

"The Christian Knowledge Society has latterly erased from one of its publications, the phrase, 'The Mother of God:'—rightly judging it to be popish. The British Critic demands its re-instatement; observing,

"'As to styling the blessed Virgin, 'The Mother of God,' did the Essex ministers ever chance to hear of the council of Ephesus?' (British Critic, Jan. 1838, p. 135.)

"While Mr. Newman asks,

"'What must have been her gifts, who was chosen to be the only near relative of the son of God?' 'What think you, was the sanctity and grace of that human nature, of which God formed his sinless Son?' 'How is it possible we should bear to gaze on the

creature's holiness in its fulness?' (Rev. J. H. Newman's Sermons, p. 8.)

"And the 75th number of the Tracts for the Times is composed of selections from the Romish Breviary, prepared and recommended for Protestant use; in the preface to which the Editor says,

"'Our adversaries have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure, which was ours as much as theirs. The publication, then, of these selections, is, as it were, an act of re-appropriation.'

"And among these prayers, thus 're-appropriated' to Protestant use, we find the following:

"'Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that we thy servants may ever prosper in perpetual health of body and mind, and by the glorious intercession of the blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, may be delivered from present sadness, and enjoy eternal bliss.' (Tracts for the Times, No. 75, p. 53.)

"'Holy Mary, and all the saints intercede for us to the Lord, that we may be worthy of His help and salvation, who liveth and reigneth, world without end.'

"'Therefore, I beseech thee, Blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the Blessed John Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, All saints, and thee, My Father, to pray the Lord our God for me.' (Tracts for the Times, No. 75; p. 61, 62.)

"17. Prayers for the Dead, and prayers to the Saints, are both advocated. To wit,

"'Prayer for God's departed servants,—since, knowing them to be in a state of imperfect bliss until the resurrection, whenever we pray for the final coming of God's kingdom, we do in fact, (if we have any thought for the departed,) pray at the same time for the perfecting of their bliss.' (Dr. Pusey's Answer, p. 23.)

"'May their souls rest in peace!' (Tracts for the Times, No. 75, p. 148.

"'Blessed Lawrence, Martyr of Christ, intercede for us.' (Tracts for the Times, No. 75, p. 119.)

"'Use thou for us thy gift of prayer
To cleanse thy brethren's sin,
To sweeten earth's infectious air,
And gain us peace within.'
—(Tracts for the Times, No. 75, p. 125.)

"'Let us keep fast on Wednesdays and Fridays; let us keep Vigil on the Sabbath with the blessed Apostle Peter, whose deeds of grace working together with our prayers, we may obtain what we seek through our Lord Jesus Christ,' &c. (Tracts for the Times, No. 75, p. 168.)

"12. The power of Absolution, and of Censure, not declaratory, but absolute and discretionary, are asserted in terms which would satisfy the most imperious demands of Rome. For instance,

"Behold your armoury! Sword and lightning shaft,
Cull'd from the stores of God's all-judging ire,
Had in your wielding left. The words that waft
Power to your voice absolving, point with fire
Your awful curse.'—(Lyra Apostol. p. 219.)

"13. To the Seven Sacraments they offer no very decided opposition. Take the following for an example:

"'The great divines of our church, since the Reformation, have not thought it inconsistent to hold that to the offices of the Church, as such, there is allied a sacramental efficacy, (and so they make a distinction between what may be called 'sacraments,' and the proper sacraments,) and at the same time maintain, in the words of the Catechism, 'that there are two sacraments only, generally necessary to salvation.' (Brit. Mag. Vol. xii. p. 521.)

"Mr. Palmer, in his Treatise on the Church, (vol. ii. p. 440,) advocates the same view. The difference between this belief and that of the church of Rome, is the most trivial that can be conceived. The Romanists assert seven sacraments; and this writer offers to admit two sacraments as 'generally necessary,' and five offices possessing 'sacramental efficacy.'

"14. And, lastly, the greatest readiness is shewn, to resume all the external forms and ceremonies which our Reformers cast away, such as the use of the crucifix, crossing, holy water, chrism, holy oil, &c. The Oxford poet sings,

"'When'er across this sinful flesh of mine
I draw the holy sign,
All good thoughts stir within me, &c.'
—(Lyra Apost. p. 14.)

"'In saying, then, 'worthy fruits of penance,' the conscience of every one is suitably addressed, that he may obtain by so much the more advantage of good works by penitence, as he has incurred heavier loss by sinning.' (Tracts for the Times, No. 75, p. 177.)

"'It appears to me plain that in all matters which seem to us indifferent or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken.' (Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 336.)

"But the reader will be almost ready

to ask, after this long enumeration of coincidences with the Romish church—in what it is that these writers differ from the Papists; and wherefore they do not at once reunite themselves to that communion? It is right that these questions should be answered; and it is but just, also, that they should be answered by themselves, and in their own words. We therefore quote at once their own explanation:—

"'We cannot join a church, did we wish it ever so much, which does not acknowledge our orders; refuses us the cup; demands our acquiescence in image worship, and excommunicates us if we do not receive it, and all other decisions of the Tridentine Council.' (British Mag. vol. ix. p. 361.)

"Here, then, we may ascertain the agreement of these writers with Popery negatively, as we have already ascertained it positively. In the above enumeration is included, we may fairly presume, all the chief grounds of difference between themselves and the church of Rome. And among these grounds, we find no mention of Transubstantiation, the Supremacy of the Pope, Purgatory, the merit of works, Prayers for the Dead, or the Celibacy of the Clergy. Not one of these is even hinted at, as furnishing sufficient cause for separation. May we not say, then, with truth, that four-fifths of the anti-Christian system is already acceded to? But there remain four points on which an objection still exists. These are, that Rome 'does not acknowledge our orders:' she 'refuses us the cup:' she 'demands our acquiescence in image worship:' she 'requires the unqualified reception of the decrees of the Council of Trent.' Now, these four points, on a closer examination, shrink down into two. For the first, when examined, amounts to little more than this:—'We cannot return to Rome, for Rome will not receive us.' The fact is, that Rome, considering the Church of England as in a state of schism, will not admit her orders to be valid. But there can be no doubt, that if the whole church applied for reconciliation, this point would be overlooked, and her orders be declared valid, by one sweeping absolution and indulgence. At present, however, Rome signalizes every victory over heresy, in the accession of a clerical convert, by a public reception, and re-ordination. This humiliation, the Oxford writers very naturally say, they cannot submit to. But it is obvious at a glance, that it is only for Rome to say, 'We dispense with this disagreeable ceremonial, and will receive you as you are;' and the first of these four difficulties, at least, would be wholly removed.

"The last of the four interposes a still slighter obstacle: it relates to the reception of the whole of the decrees of the Council of Trent. Now this difficulty is hardly more than an imaginary one; for the Romish church itself does not universally receive those decrees."

After this extensive extract we have not left ourselves room for many observations. Much more might be added to the same effect, but that we trust this sample is sufficient to shew the anti-scriptural and anti-anglican character of the tenets under consideration. It is a very afflicting subject. May the great Head of his church avert these alarming omens, and keep us steadfast in the faith and simplicity of the Gospel.

We had closed the volume; but having opened it again at the very important concluding chapter entitled "Summary of Principles; the Via Media, &c." we will venture to extract, notwithstanding the length of the foregoing citation, a portion of the author's well-digested statements respecting the character of the doctrines which are making such havoc among some of the unskilful members of our church.

"We have already traced the identity which exists, between the Popery which is now uprearing itself in the midst of the Church of England, and the Popery of Rome; and have shewn how very minute and trivial is the distance which is still left between them. But it seems advisable, before leaving the subject, to resolve these details into their first principles, and to shew, if possible, in what fundamental points the preachers of this revived Popery have erred; abandoning the doctrines of the Church of England, and adopting those of the great Anti-christian apostacy.

"I. The first grand error, then, into which these teachers fall, is, that of denying the sufficiency and supremacy of God's word, the Holy Scriptures, as our one sole, and sufficient Rule of Faith: and setting up as a necessary addition and accompaniment

to it, the Traditions of the Church. In this they so entirely coincide with the Romanists, that Dr. Wiseman, the Pope's missionary in this country, has contented himself with quoting from Mr. Newman's work, on 'the Arians of the Fourth Century,' the following passage:

"'Surely, the Sacred Volume was never intended, and was not adapted, to teach us our creed; however, certain it is, that we can prove our creed from it, when it has once been taught us. From the very first, the rule has been, as a matter of fact, for the church to teach the truth, and then to appeal to the Scripture in vindication of its own teaching, upon which the Romish controversialist remarks: 'This is more than sufficient for my purpose; it not only admits the premises which I have laid down, but goes as far as I can wish, in the consequences it draws.' (Wiseman's Vth Lecture, p. 139.)

"In the Tracts for the Times, No. 71, the same doctrine is thus stated:

"'The Bible is the record of necessary truth; and the 'Church Catholic's' tradition is the interpreter of it.'

"But Chillingworth had, long ago, set this deceit in the light of truth, with his usual power and clearness: he says, 'He that would usurp an absolute lordship and tyranny over any people, need not put himself to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and disannulling the laws made to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their intent, and compass his own design as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleases, and to have his interpretations and additions stand for laws; if he can rule his people by his laws, and his laws by his lawyers. So the Church of Rome, to establish her tyranny over men's consciences, needed not either to abolish or corrupt the Holy Scriptures, the pillars and supporters of Christian liberty. But the more expedite way, and therefore the more likely to be the successful, was to gain the opinion and esteem of being the public and authorised interpreter of them, and the authority of adding to them what doctrine she pleased, under the title of traditions or definitions. For by this means, she might both serve herself of all those clauses of Scripture which might be drawn to cast a favourable countenance upon her ambitious pretences,—which, had the Scriptures been abolished, she could not have done; and yet be secure enough of having neither her power limited, nor her corruptions and abuses reformed by them; this being once settled in the minds of men, that unwritten doctrines, if proposed by her, were to be received with equal reverence to those that were written; and that the sense of Scripture was not that which it seemed to reason and understanding to be, but that which the Church of Rome should declare it, seem that never so unreasonable and incongruous.' (Chillingworth's Works, fol. p. 40.)

"And it is very important that we should always bear in mind, that it is one unerring test of truth or error,—whether the teachers of any given doctrine are ready to submit it to the judgment of God's word or not? 'To the Law and to the Testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.' The Bereans are praised by the Spirit of God, for that they, being laymen, 'searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so.'

"But to this test, no teacher of error will ever willingly consent to be brought. In this aversion, all shades and contrarieties of heresy agree. With the Socinian, reason is to be the judge;—with the Irvingite, 'the Church,' or 'the voice of the Spirit.' The Quaker equally refuses the simple word of God, and prefers 'the inward witness:'—the Romanist asserts 'the authority of the Church,' to declare what the sense of Scripture is;—and the 'Tracts for the Times' refer us to 'the Church Catholic's Tradition.' And inasmuch as each and all of these refuse to abide by the plain and unambiguous decisions of God's word, we know and are assured, by the most certain of all tests, that it is because there is in each and in all of them, some human admixture, which cannot abide this trial."

"But it has been asked, Do you mean, then, to set up every man's own *private interpretation* of Scripture as his rule of faith? Or, if not, what better guide have you to propose than that of the Church's teaching, or the Church's tradition? It is strange that this sophistical dilemma should have perplexed any one. But it was well answered in the *Downside Discussion*. The statute law of the realm is the rule of life to all persons within that realm. We do not mean, the statute law according to each man's own private interpretation, but *the statute law itself!* So the Holy Scriptures are our rule of faith:—The Holy Scriptures *themselves;* not the Holy Scriptures *as we choose to interpret them!*

"But it has been objected,—that a meaning, an interpretation, must be attached to the words of Scripture, or the mere act of reading them will be of no use:—Is, then, each man to attach his own meaning as he reads; or ought he not rather to accept the interpretation of the catholic or universal church?

"The first answer to this, is, that to the great bulk of mankind, to whom, in dealing with these matters, we must always have reference,—there is no such thing available or accessible, as this alleged 'interpretation of the Catholic church.' Let a man turn on whichever side he will, he is sure to find whatever party he meets, laying claim to 'the consent of antiquity.'

"But the second reply is, that in any difficulty, a far more safe and certain guide is provided for us, than all the wit or wisdom of man could furnish. The promise is, that 'the way-faring man, though a fool, shall not err therein,' and this promise is made doubly sure by the means provided for its accomplishment. 'Your heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him.' Here, then, is an interpreter incomparably beyond all that man could devise: a sure, an unerring guide: One; not a thousand conflicting authorities; and one too, obtained by 'asking,' instead of lying hid in the multitudinous volumes of the Councils and the Fathers."

"II. But the next leading and fundamental error of this school consists in an undue exaltation of what is termed 'Antiquity.' Aiming, on the one hand, to pull down the Scriptures from their rightful elevation, as the ONE standard of truth; they endeavour, on the other, to elevate most unduly, certain of the works of men, in such sort as to bring them nearly to the same level with God's word.

"To shew that we do not misrepresent the views of these writers, we shall just observe, that in one of their publications, we are told that to assert the principle of 'the Bible, and nothing but the Bible,' is to be guilty of 'an unthankful rejection of another great gift, equally from God,' (Tracts for the Times, No 71, p. 8); to wit, tradition. In like manner, a departed friend is thus lauded:—

"'He was one of those, who, feeling strongly the inadequacy of their own intellects to guide them to religious truth, are prepared to throw themselves unreservedly on Revelation, wherever found, in Scripture or Antiquity.' (British Critic, Jan. 1838, p. 224.)

"Here is an exaltation, without any qualification or obscurity, of what is called 'Antiquity,' to the same rank with 'Scripture,' as equally the product of 'Revelation.' And in another page it is said, 'How little should we know of the interpretation of Scripture without the works of Origen, of Tertullian, &c.' (Ibid. p. 47.)

"Thus we are at one and the same time informed, that the writings of the fathers are to be looked upon as a portion of revealed truth; and that they are absolutely essential to our understanding the Scriptures. Now it would be idle to ask for proof of either of these assertions. Both, clearly, are mere assumptions; and of the boldest, nay, of the most rash and groundless description."

"We have seen that one of the Oxford writers talks of 'throwing ourselves unreservedly on the guidance of Revelation, whether found in Scripture or antiquity.' And if we ask, what is included under this term, 'Antiquity,' we find that there is no intention of confining its application to the works of the apostolic Fathers,—to those who wrote in the days when the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were still vouchsafed to the church;—but that we are to be carried down a course of centuries, and still to accept the perpetually-deteriorating works of the divines of the day, as the products of 'Revelation.' It is said,

"'Three centuries and more were necessary for the infant church to attain her mature and perfect form and due stature. Athanasius, Basil, and Ambrose are the fully-instructed doctors of her doctrine, morals, and discipline.' (British Mag. vol. ix. p. 359.)

"Now here we have a principle introduced, which is obviously inconsistent with the ground previously taken. We were first told that the study of 'Antiquity' was important, inasmuch as it introduced us to the contemporaries and immediate successors of the Apostles. But now it is argued, that the Fathers rise in authority and in value, in proportion as their distance from the apostolic times increases! Common sense will teach us just the contrary. The main ground of the respect and veneration which the earlier Fathers may justly claim, arises from the fact of their having been actually conversant either with the apostles themselves, or with those appointed by the apostles to various offices in the church. But advance two or three hundred years down the stream of time, and what is the inevitable result? You come to a race of divines, who were as far removed from the Apostles in distance of time, and probably also

in likeness of doctrine, as are the present theologians of Germany, from the days and the opinions of Luther and Melancthon. When authority, therefore, is claimed for the writings of Basil or Ambrose, we naturally demand to know, on what ground the claim is made: Not on the existence of the special gifts of the Spirit, for those had been withdrawn; not on the score of a personal knowledge of the apostles and their ways, for this was prevented by the intervention of three centuries; not on a close adherence to Apostolic usages; for it is even made a matter of boast, that they had 'matured,' i. e. added to them. What, then, remains to claim our especial and submissive attention? Nothing, but their intrinsic worth, whatever that may be. In other words, we ought to read Basil or Ambrose with just as much veneration as we read Cranmer or Ridley, but assuredly with not a whit more. And, thus weighed and compared together, the value of the works of the sixth century will be found to fall far, very far short of those of the sixteenth.

"III. The next fundamental error to which we shall allude, in this school of theologians, is a constant tendency to dwell more on the 'outward and visible sign,' than on the 'inward and spiritual grace;'—to pay greater attention to the form and vehicle in which the divine mercy is conveyed to us, than to the truth and power of the blessing itself. We are aware that this imputation has already been declared to be 'uncharitable;' but we know not how to estimate or describe a body of theological writers, otherwise than by their published works; and that this is really the spirit of those works, will hardly be denied; nevertheless, to leave no room for cavil, we will offer an instance or two in proof.

"1. The Lord Jesus Christ, just before his ascension, commissioned his apostles to 'go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' He charged them to 'baptize all nations, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and to teach them to observe all things' that he had commanded; and he added, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' Now of the power thus vested in the apostles, and the authority given to them (impliedly only, not expressly) to transfer that power to certain successors; we hear much from these writers. It is, in fact, the centre of their system; for they tell us, that 'The very notion, that representatives of the apostles are now on earth, from whose communion we may obtain grace, as the first christians did from the apostles, is surely, when admitted, of a most transporting and persuasive character; it will supply the desideratum which exists in our actual teaching at this day.' (British Mag. vol. ix. p. 365.)

"Here, most clearly, it is the authority, vested in certain persons by succession, that is held up as the grand 'desideratum.' To be commissioned by those who derive their own commission in a direct line from the apostles, and thus from Christ, is the main thing. But the great end and object of the ministry so commissioned,—namely, 'to preach the gospel to every creature,' is wholly forgotten; or the writer, who is so 'transported' with the idea of having actual 'representatives of the apostles on earth,' would never have lost sight of the fact, that an immense majority of these 'representatives of the apostles,' now living on the earth, are among the greatest traitors to Christ, and the most bitter enemies to his gospel, that can possibly be found. If the writer had not thought more of the 'authority' and the 'commission,' than of the warfare to be waged, he would hardly have failed to remember, that for whole centuries the chief employment of these 'representatives of the apostles' consisted in hunting out of their 'dens and caves of the earth,' those few real disciples of Christ, 'of whom the world was not worthy.' But it is evident that the authority conferred, is the chief matter in this writer's eyes; and that the object and end of the 'mission—the preaching of the gospel—fills quite a subordinate place.

"2. This is placed beyond a doubt, by the constant preference shewn for the Romish apostacy over the reformed churches of Germany, Scotland, &c. We have already seen, that Rome is constantly addressed as our 'mother,' 'sister,' and the like, and 'our present separation from it,' declared to be 'a grievous calamity' (British Magazine, vol. ix. p. 243); while the church of Scotland is likened to Samaria, and even to Israel in a state of utter apostacy. Now this is entirely to overlook the inspired description of Rome, as 'the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth: drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;' and from whom God commands his people to 'Come out, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.' It is also entirely to forget the broad and notorious fact, that Italy, so especially to be envied as possessing

'representatives of the apostles on earth, from whom we may derive grace,' is a land wholly given up to idolatry, infidelity, superstition, and degrading vice; while Scotland is a country, where the gospel is preached, and honoured, and believed, and where christians abound, and faith and the fruits of faith are every where visible. But all these things matter not, when a man acquires the habit of looking more to forms and names, than to things —to ordinances and sacraments, more than to grace and holiness.

"3. The like error runs through all their views of the sacraments. The ministers of the church are declared to be the only ministers in England, 'who have a right to be perfectly sure that they have the body and blood of Christ to give to the people.' Thus the value of the sacrament is made wholly to depend upon the kind of ordination received by the minister, instead of laying, as the Church constantly does, the chief stress on the faith of the receiver. The church declares plainly, that unbelievers do not eat the body and blood of Christ (Art. xxix.); and it also distinctly states, that what remains after communion, though consecrated, is nothing but 'bread and wine.' Clearly, then, the church looks to the substantial part, the spiritual reception of the sacrament, by faith. But the writers whom we have quoted, lay their greatest stress upon the minor circumstances of consecration, whether by a priest or a deacon, and the like. And their argument goes to prove, that in the Church of Scotland, with hundreds of godly ministers, and thousands of pious communicants, there has not been a single real sacrament, for nearly two hundred years! And that merely because there has not been a priest, in the apostolic succession, to convert the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; while in infidel and debased Spain and Italy, our Lord's body and blood is constantly offered to the people, inasmuch as the priests who there officiate,—unbelievers, themselves, as most of them are,—are yet the right line of 'Apostolic succession.'

If our readers have as carefully perused and weighed these passages as their importance deserves, they will not be slow in coming to the author's conclusion, that,

"The Via Media then, of the Church of England, is not the Via Media of the Oxford Tracts. The first is a wise and just moderation, holding firm to essentials; offering no compromise to the enemies of Christ; decided to have 'no peace with Rome;' and yet, at the same time that it maintains its own views of church government, distinctly and meekly offering the right hand of fellowship to all other churches 'holding the head,' without requiring them to take the same identical view of those questions of church government, on which the Scriptures allow a degree of obscurity to rest."

"The object, we are told, is, 'to recall the minds, especially of the clergy, to the old standard divinity of their church.' Now if this were honestly meant, should we not have heard, before now, of the preparation of New Oxford editions of the lights of the Reformation, not only of Cranmer and Jewel, but of Latimer also, and Bradford; of Philpot, and Hooper, and Becon, and Bale? Why should not Legh Richmond's admirable outline of 'the Fathers of the English Church,' be traced anew, and filled up by those whose peculiar position gives them peculiar advantages? What a blessing would a good and moderately-priced collection of this kind be, to the English clergy! But we see no trace of even a desire or a disposition to do any thing of the kind. They talk of 'the old standard divinity of the church;' but when we come to name the authors, they can think of none but Laud, and Heylin, and Leslie, and Bull! Now we deny that these have the least title to be considered our 'old standard divines.' We want the works of those who founded and built up our church; but they offer us those only who tried their utmost, and partly succeeded in pulling it down!"

As the Layman with great ability, extensive reading, and scriptural soundness of doctrine, has so well described, and refuted, the cardinal assumptions of this Via-Median—that is, semi-papist, and "something more"—school, we wish that he had particularly directed his attention to what we have again and again mentioned as its most awful characteristic, namely, its delusive teachings in regard to the "doctrines of grace," and the way of a sinner's justification and salvation. It is evident that he is aware of at least the defectiveness of the system as respects these momentous particulars; for he observes on one occasion,—

"Now, just in passing, we may remark, that here is a system, a creed

without one word of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of regeneration, of justification, or of vital holiness; all is external, visible, formal;"

but he has not thoroughly probed its positive delinquencies. The late Mr. Knox frankly declared to Mr. Macaulay, when pressed in argument, that practically he could see no place for the atonement in his system; we say "practically," for this is the very hinge of the question. The doctrine of Dr. Pusey and his colleagues is, that through the atonement of Christ and "the faith of the church," we were justified in baptism in our infancy; that a new nature was then given to us, which enables us to live all our life long without mortal sin; and that we thus keep up and increase our justification; but that if we fall into mortal sin, there is no warrant for us to apply to the blood of the atonement; we can be re-justified—if indeed we ever can be so, which is represented as very doubtful—only by the baptism of tears and the penance of soul-purifying mortification; so that as infant baptism is generally practised throughout Christendom, the Oxford Tract writers argue that the doctrine of justification by faith, though abstractedly true, is practically obsolete; and in like manner the atonement is practically obsolete also, as we never were, during our conscious years, in a condition in which it was requisite for us to lay hold of it, except to make up for venial sins; there being no ground, they say, to believe that it is available after baptism for great ones. When Protestants speak of preaching Christ crucified, they mean, in an especial manner, preaching his atonement; but the papists, and the new Via Median divines, mean preaching what is specifically the work of the Holy Spirit. The worse than jesuitical slyness (we must speak truly and honestly, however offensively) with which the Oxford Tract divines, while affecting to write boldly, couch their worst doctrines in measured and well-sounding terms, so as to convey poison insidiously in an unsuspected cup, prevents many persons from clearly discerning the real character and awful delusiveness of their doctrines; but if the Layman will adequately study this part of the question, he will see that we have not exaggerated the evil. One of last year's Tracts, No. 80, (which, with many others, we have never yet alluded to, for to keep up with the masses of these pestiferous publications, would far exceed our limits, and the patience of our readers) throws some light upon the opinions of the writers on these matters; though still there is so much of insidious nebulosity, that an inexperienced reader might not readily discern the extent of the false doctrine; and when it is pointed out, the writers may exhibit some shading off, or ambiguous statement, which, though it does not lessen the virulence of the poison, enables them to deceive the unwary, or even to assert that they mean what truly orthodox and evangelical Christians mean, only that they explain the matter better, and add some things which had been omitted. We will quote a few passages from this tract, in corroboration of our remarks. The very title of the Tract is significative, "On reserve in communicating religious knowledge." One of the chief doctrines, respecting which there is to be this esoteric reserve, is that of the atonement; and though the writers so far practise the reserve which they recommend as not fully and explicitly to state their opinions, yet our strong persuasion, from the whole tenour of this and other tracts, is, that they believe what the Papists intended to express in the

proverb that Ignorance is the mother of devotion; and that their real meaning is, (slily making St. Basil their stalking horse)—that, though "for those whose office it is to instruct" it is proper that the Bible should be in their hands, it were better, in the case of the laity, to substitute the teaching of the church, that is, of the priest, except where the priest sees fit to grant permission for the catechumen to read—we were going to say for himself; but this they never conceive to be allowable—by himself. We will now thread a few beads from this Oxford rosary:

"Much of what is here said may be applied to an indiscriminate distribution of Bibles and religious publications.... Are we rightly estimating the consequence of a bare knowledge of the Gospel? As a proof that religious knowledge has been otherwise considered may be mentioned one of the short practical rules attributed to St. Basil: the question is asked 'whether it be advantageous to learn many things out of Scripture?' the answer implies, that, though it be necessary for those whose office it is to instruct, yet that all should be cautious that, according to the Apostle's injunction, 'they think soberly,' earnestly learn their own duty, and do it, only caring for and bent on attaining that blessing, 'Well done, good servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many.'"

"We now proceed to the consideration of a subject most important in this point of view,—the prevailing notion of bringing forward the Atonement explicitly and prominently on all occasions. It is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture, nor do we find any sanction for it in the gospels. If the epistle of St. Paul appear to favour it, it is only at first sight. The singular characteristic of St. Paul, as shown in all his epistles and speeches, seems to have been a going out of himself to enter into the feelings and put himself in the circumstances of others. This will account for the occasions on which he brings forward this doctrine; as in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians."

"There is another point which might seem to countenance it, that St. Paul speaks of himself as at all times preaching 'Christ crucified;'.... but it is a great mistake to suppose that.... by preaching the atonement, we are preaching what St. Paul meant by Christ crucified.... It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world, it is our humiliation together with Him, mortification of the flesh, being made conformable to His sufferings and his death. It was a doctrine which was 'foolishness to the wise and an offence to the Jew,' on account of the abasement of the natural man which it implied. Whereas, the notion now prevailing is attractive to the world, in the naked way in which it is put forth, so as rather to diminish than to increase a sense of responsibility and consequent humiliation. If the doctrine of the Atonement is conveyed in the expression of Christ crucified, as used by St. Paul, it is by teaching, at the same time, the necessity of our mortification, which is repugnant to opinions now received. It is expressing, in other words, our Saviour's declaration, 'he that cometh after me must take up his cross daily and follow me.'"

"The cause of the extraordinary prevalence of this modern opinion, of the necessity of preaching the Atonement thus explicitly, seems to be this, &c. &c. And not only is the exclusive and naked exposure of so very sacred a truth unscriptural and dangerous, but, as Bishop Wilson says, the comforts of religion ought to be applied with great caution. And moreover to require, as is sometimes done, from both grown persons and children, an explicit declaration of a belief in the atonement, and the full assurance of its power, appears equally untenable."

If these things are not sufficiently explicit, we recommend all who doubt to peruse Mr. Newman's sermons on Justification. What will they say to such passages as the following?

"Two main views concerning the mode of our justification are found in the writings of English divines; on the one hand, that this great gift of our Lord's passion is vouchsafed to those who are moved by God's grace to claim it, [Mr. Newman ought to have said, humbly and gratefully to lay hold of it;] on the other, to those who by the same grace are moved to do their duty. These separate doctrines, justification by faith, and justification by obedience, thus simply stated, are not at all inconsistent with one another; and by religious men, especially if not divines, will be held both at once, or indiffe-

rently either the one or other, as circumstances may determine .... Justification by faith only, thus treated, (as the foundation or 'leading idea' of a theology) is an erroneous, justification by obedience is a defective, view of Christian doctrine."

"Our formularies speak of faith as in many ways essential to our justification, but not as the instrument of originally gaining it. This peculiar instrumentality of faith is the Lutheran tenet here to be discussed; and is plainly the consequence of what has been already adverted to, the attaching an exclusive importance to the doctrine of justification by faith only. Those who hold that this doctrine declares only one out of several truths relating to the mode of our justification, even though they express themselves like the strict Lutherans, may really agree with our Church; but it is far otherwise with those who hold it, as comprehending all that is told us about that mode."

"When we go on to inquire what it is which God has made his instrument, then, as I have said, we find ourselves upon the main subject of dispute between ourselves and the strict followers of the German Reformer. Our Church considers it to be the sacrament of baptism; they consider it to be Faith."

We protest against this shuffling sort of pro and con argumentation. Why does not Mr. Newman plainly tell us that sanctification is justification, and that we are justified by our good works. We recommend the Layman to lay open some of these "refuges of lies" in his next edition.

ON THE NATIONAL CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

1. *Six Lectures upon the Establishment and Extension of National Churches, delivered at the Hanover Square Rooms, London, at the request of the Christian Influence Society.* By the Rev. T. CHALMERS, D.D.
2. *The Call upon the Church considered in two Essays.* By W. Roberts, Esq. M. A., and the Rev. W. NICHOLSON, M.A.; *to which the Prize of two hundred guineas was awarded by* (the Rev. H. Raikes, M.A., Chancellor of the diocese of Chester, and the Venerable George Hodgson, M.A., Archdeacon of Stafford, for) *the Christian Influence Society.*
3. *The Parochial System; an appeal to English Churchmen.* By Henry W. WILBERFORCE, M.A., of Oriel college, Oxford, curate of Bransgore, Hants. *To which the premium of two hundred guineas, offered by the Committee of the Christian Influence Society, was adjudged by the Rev. W. Dealtry, D.D. Archdeacon of Winchester, and the Rev. Professor Scholefield.*
4. *The Sixth Annual Report of the Christian Influence Society.*

THE Society mentioned in the above headings was instituted in 1832, by a few clergymen and laymen, who considered that opportunities often occur of doing good, which are not duly made use of, from the objects to be attained not falling within the scope of any existing institution, and there being no machinery ready formed which might be conveniently adapted to the particular occasion. We could mention a score of instances in which it was highly important to concentrate and combine the exertions of the friends of religion to promote some good or to prevent some evil; but the golden opportunity was lost, because what was every body's business was accounted nobody's business; and it was not found easy, or perhaps possible, at the moment to set up the apparatus necessary for influencing, or giving effect to, public opinion. In most cases a committee has to be formed, a public meeting perhaps to be

summoned, and great labour and expence to be encountered in printing, advertising, and other details, and when the temporary occasion is over, the whole corps of benevolent agency is disbanded; whereas the staff might have been found useful if kept ready to act upon future emergencies. We well remember when it was first proposed to petition parliament to open India to Christian instruction, how difficult it was to organize the engineering department necessary to enlighten the public upon the question, to procure petitions, to stir up individuals and societies, to get the subject fairly discussed in the legislature, and to cause truth to preponderate with its due weight in the national councils. With great labour the result was at length attained; but when the question of the burning of widows, and more recently the abolition of the polluted pilgrim-tax, and the coercing of Christians to take a part in idolatrous rites, came under discussion, there was no institution whose specific business it was to turn its attention to these subjects, and to correspond with various societies, and with pious, zealous, and well-informed individuals throughout the land, so as with the greatest energy, and the least loss of time, to bring the religious principle of the nation to bear upon the desired object. The Christian Influence Society might, we think, have legitimately turned its attention to these subjects—as perhaps it did; but it does not yet appear to have gained sufficient strength, and an adequate command of funds, to enable it to prosecute one in many of the important matters to which Christian influence might be usefully directed. One of the immediate causes of the origin of the Society we believe was the condition of the Church of England at the period of its formation. At the beginning of the reign of the late king, in consequence of the continental revolutions, the discussions on the Reform Bill, and other circumstances, the Dissenters were commencing that course of unjust and unhallowed attack upon our venerable national communion which they have continued ever since with a virulence which has damaged themselves far more than it has us. Pamphlets, newspapers, and speeches in parliament and at political and ecclesiastical meetings, were teeming with false charges; dissenting committees were formed to prosecute the siege; while within the garrison there was no corps of organized defenders to meet these skirmishing assaults, to repel which, in a prompt and effective manner, did not fall within the province of any existing institution. It was equally obvious that while the Church was defended, it needed also to be purified and strengthened; and that the combined influence of its friends would be well employed in rectifying abuses and promoting improvements. There was much to be done in diffusing information, and urging salutary measures, respecting church building, national education, the abolition of pluralities and non-residence, the safe and satisfactory commutation of tithes, and other matters connected with the spiritual efficiency of the church; and we believe that the labours of this institution, though not obtrusive, have been well-directed and useful in several of these particulars. We see indeed great difficulties in combining the efforts of the friends of the Church generally, in an institution which from its very nature must embrace various objects that cannot be defined beforehand, as they must often depend upon the openings, as they arise in the

events of Providence, for useful exertion; but the specimens of the Society's proceedings during the last year, exhibited in the lectures and essays which have given rise to our remarks, must, we think, commend themselves to every friend of the Church. Before we proceed to notice them, we will copy from the last Report the following account of the purposes of the Society:—

"1.—To offer up, at the times which may be fixed for their Meetings, united prayer to Almighty God, for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the people of this land; and to implore that He will be graciously pleased to bestow his abundant blessing upon all the means which may be used for the attainment of those ends.

"2.—To take into consideration, at these times of meeting, all matters connected with the cause of Religion, with respect to which it may be thought desirable that application should be made either to the Ministers of state for the time being, or to the Bishops, or to the Legislature; or that any other proceedings should be adopted: and thereupon either to take measures for attaining the objects in view, or to bring the same under the notice of pious and reflecting men throughout the kingdom, who may be likely to do what is necessary for their attainment.

"3.—To consider whether any, and what, measures should be adopted in reference to the use of the Press, in order to give a right direction to the public mind on the subject of Religion and Morals and the general state of Society; and to adopt such measures as shall be thought advisable in this respect.

"4.—To establish and keep up an intercourse and correspondence with men of piety and influence in the metropolis, and in all parts of the Country, with a view to the objects of the Association.

"The management of the Society shall be vested in twenty Lay Members, together with those Clergymen who are at present Town Members, and such other Clergymen in or about London as shall hereafter be elected."

In pursuance of these objects, the committee of the Society projected a course of lectures upon the general principle of National ecclesiastical Establishments, to be followed up by another course "upon the excellence and value of the English National Church Establishment, together with the circumstances which impede its efficiency, and the best remedies for such defects." The first course was undertaken, at the request of the committee, by Dr. Chalmers, the question not having direct reference to the doctrines or discipline of any particular church; and being one with which that distinguished individual is peculiarly conversant, having studied it both theoretically and practically, and having had to fight the battle of the National Church of Scotland, under circumstances similar to those which have characterised the opposition to that of England and Ireland. The second course is proposed to be delivered by the Rev. C. Benson, the master of the Temple. Dr. Chalmers having, with sound wisdom and true Christian philosophy, equalled only by his remarkable zeal, ability, and eloquence, shown the solidity of the foundation upon which national churches rest, Jesus Christ being the cornerstone; Mr. Benson has a most important, and eminently useful though arduous task, that of shewing what kind of a superstructure ought to be erected upon it, and of suggesting, in regard to our own church, whatever he may consider needful for repairing, strengthening, or beautifying the structure already erected.

We had intended, upon the publication of Dr. Chalmers's lectures, to give an analysis of them, with copious extracts; but our purpose having been anticipated by the ample reports of them in the newspapers, and the extensive circulation of the authentic publication, we should only be repeating what has been already before most of our readers in other forms. An extraordinary degree of interest was excited by these lectures;

and the reception of them by a crowded yet select auditory of the highest respectability, including very many persons of high station and influence, was more than enthusiastic, for it was the homage of solid conviction, and not the mere effervescence of oratorical excitement. The best proof of their practical effect, next to the many minds which they have swayed by powerful argument, or excited by lively and energetic displays of truth, is the acerbity of opposition with which they have been assailed by radicalism, infidelity, popery, socinianism, and every species of dissent.

The following well-condensed outline of Dr. Chalmers's argument, in the Report of the Christian Influence Society, will be acceptable, both to those who have not the lectures, and those who have, as the expansion of Dr. Chalmer's style of writing renders a syllabus a useful accompaniment:

"Dr. Chalmers, after stating that a sure legal provision for the expense of religious ministration, might be taken as the basis of his definition of a Religious Establishment, and after shewing that this may exist without the shadow of dependence upon the State in things Ecclesiastical, proceeded to prove the utter inefficacy of the substitutes which have been proposed for a National Establishment, viz. The system of a free trade in Christian Instruction, proposed by some, and the Voluntary Principle advocated by others—the two being frequently confounded together by the undistinguishing advocates of the Voluntary Principle.—He considered the free trade system, as what may be called Internal Voluntaryism; that is to say, where a man makes a voluntary return, in the shape of a price or equivalent, for Christian Ministrations to himself and his family; but as this system necessarily leaves out all who have not both the wealth and the will to purchase these ministrations, or in other words, the great mass of the population, it is of course utterly inadequate to the general Christian instruction of the people. In most dissenting meeting houses, their pecuniary resources from this Internal Voluntaryism are wholly insufficient for their support, and they therefore require to be helped by the offerings of those who do not benefit by the Ministrations—which help from others may be called external Voluntaryism—and extraneous aid being thus found necessary, the question arises, whether the rendering of such aid shall be left to private Christians, under the impulse of a religious benevolence, or shall be supplied by an enlightened government, under the impulse of a paternal regard for the highest interests of the people—it being on all hands agreed, that the outcast millions of our people ought to be reclaimed from ignorance and irreligion. The answer to this question is to be found in the present ignorance and ungodliness of immense multitudes of our people, which affords the most unquestionable evidence of the utter inefficiency, both of the free trade system and of all the additions made to it by external voluntaryism, and leads irresistibly to the conclusion, that a National Establishment is of absolute necessity, if the Nation is not to be left in Heathenish darkness and sin. Dr. Chalmers then proceeded to consider the circumstances which determine a government to select one denomination of Christianity for the National Religion, and which brought on and justified an Enactment for the provision of a National Clergy. Constantine was led either by piety or policy to throw the shield of his Imperial Patronage over Christianity, and to support it as the National Religion. At the Reformation, a change took place, from Popery to Protestantism, which was justified by motives, both of conscience and patriotism. Either of these motives is conclusive to determine the question, whether Protestantism or Popery should be maintained by the Government of this Country; the only remaining question is, as to the propriety of selecting one denomination from among the varieties of Evangelical Protestants for the privileges and honours of an Establishment; the propriety of such a selection mainly depends upon the necessity of a Religious Establishment being formed upon the territorial principle, that is to say, that each Clergyman should have a certain geographical district, of whose families he shall be the Minister, and with respect to whom, he shall superadd week day and household Ministrations, to those of the Sabbath and the Pulpit. In this, the great strength of an Establishment lies, as thus bringing the overtures of Christian Instruction to the door of every family. An Establishment is necessary, in order that the people may be served with the Ministrations of the Gospel, either without

price, or at a price which they can afford; and a Territorial Establishment is necessary, in order that these Ministrations may be brought to the people, instead of waiting for the people to go forth in quest of them; the full advantage, however, of this territorial system cannot be combined with the endowment of different sects, and therefore some one denomination must be singled out for the Establishment. In making this selection, Rulers should feel no difficulty in rejecting that Church which would subordinate the authority of man; and it being necessary, for the sake of giving effect to the territorial principle, that one denomination only should be employed, the working out of this great principle must not be thwarted and impeded, because minute differences in theology have arisen between different sects; nor must the Government on this account break up the territorial principle, that great barrier against the inroads of Heathenism. Hence the necessity for the selection of one denomination for the National Establishment."

Dr. Chalmers appears to us to have been eminently successful in establishing these heads of argument; which proved practically effective in a very eminent degree. We think that he might with great advantage have availed himself more largely of scriptural proof and illustration, and have interwoven more of matter directly spiritual and devotional in his arguments and appeals; and we conclude that he abstained from this only because he considered these views of the question already familiar to most of his auditors, and that as he was on short allowance as to time, he wished to avail himself of the circumstance of his lectures being delivered on a secular day, and in a secular place, to touch upon various important points which cannot be appropriately discussed on the Lord's day, and in the Lord's house. He also stooped to assume very low ground in shewing why one religious denomination may be preferred to another for national endowment; for his doing which we certainly have no cause to quarrel with him, since, if he had come to speak of relative claims, he must of course have preferred his own communion to ours; and we understand his argument to be meant *à fortiori*, that if a good thing may be upheld, though something else may be good also, on the ground that we cannot have both; and must therefore choose one, or not have either; much more is the argument for a National Church Establishment valid, if Episcopalians in England and Ireland, and Presbyterians in Scotland, believe the best is their own. Dr. Chalmers, himself a Presbyterian, surrounded chiefly by Episcopalians, was arguing a general question as respects the whole of Christ's church militant here on earth; but we presume that it is not unlawful for each of us to love our own regiment the best, as believing its uniform and regulations to be most scriptural; and as Dr. Chalmers, cannot think it uncharitable to advocate at home what he considers to be the peculiar claims of his own communion, he will not, we hope, think us unbrotherly in adding that we are glad that an episcopal clergyman, Mr. Benson, is to shew "the excellence and value" of ours.

We now turn to the prize essays, which, in furtherance of the same excellent purposes, the Christian Influence Society has elicited, by proposing two premiums of two hundred guineas each, under the guarantee of arbitrators whose names were eminently calculated to inspire confidence in the writers, the committee, and the public. As the fulness of the comprehensive questions proposed, does not appear in the title-pages of the Essays, we quote the specification from the report of the committee. Mr. Wilberforce's subject was:

"The duties and responsibilities of Christians in the middle and higher classes of society in this country, in regard to the employment of their time,

substance, influence, mental attainments, and all other talents, in forwarding suitable plans for the spiritual instruction and benefit of those large masses of our fellow subjects, who are now practically living in darkness and in the region of the shadow of death—with reference especially to the instrumentality of the Established Church—and to such measures of an enlarged and comprehensive character as shall be pointed out in the essay for the attainment of the desired end."

The subject for the premium awarded jointly to Mr. Roberts and Mr. Nicholson was:

"The character, qualifications, and conduct, requisite in the ministers of religion, as pointed out in the Holy Scriptures, (whether by express precept or necessary implication;) with reference especially to the offices of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, in the Established Church of England and Ireland;—the high duties and weighty responsibilities attaching both to the persons who appoint, and to those who are appointed, to these holy offices;—the great evils arising from unsuitable appointments, which all who love God, and desire the best interests of their fellow-countrymen, have in many instances to deplore;—and the plans, in accordance with the spirit of our Civil and Ecclesiastical Constitution, whereby, under the Divine blessing, these evils might be obviated, and the benefit of a faithful, zealous, and spiritually-minded Ministry, be obtained for every parish throughout the land;"

Mr. H. Wilberforce condenses his thesis into a review of the parochial system in theory and practice, and of measures for its restoration; with remarks on the degree of liberality and self-denial demanded by the principles of the Gospel, and the duty of employing our influence and political privileges on behalf of the Church. His essay is simple and unpretending, but well-measured, full of appropriate statistical facts, and thoroughly business-like; the author being too much engrossed with the serious importance of his subject to make it a theme for display. We were much impressed with his scriptural and zealous exhortations to greatly enlarged measures of self-denial and liberality, and the religious use of power and influence. In common with Mr. Roberts and Mr. Nicholson, he justly regards "the parochial system" as the basis on which, by the Divine blessing, must rest the best hopes of the nation. We do not concur with him in every one of his details; we do not, for instance, think that the plan of founding clerical collegiate establishments in our large towns, would be free from very serious objections; we do not agree with him—ardently as we wish to see churches built with as much magnificence as comports with Christian simplicity, and so liberally endowed as to afford a competent income for the clergyman—that it were better in the present urgent want of the means of Christian instruction in populous districts, to expend "fifty thousand pounds" on one new church and endowment, than to cause the erection of many less amply, but still usefully and effectively, appointed; nor is our charity so large as his, in regard to the motives which made church-building "a passion," in former ages; for popery took advantage of the ignorance and selfishness of her votaries to stimulate them to deeds of posthumous munificence; nor do we attribute the neglect of church-building, during the last century, so much to public apathy, as to the impediments systematically heaped in the track of this good work, by unwise laws, ecclesiastical prejudices, sordid interests, private jealousies, and party suspicions; which even our modern church-building acts, and the increased encouragement given by our prelates to the discharge of this urgent duty, have not yet wholly removed. Mr. H. Wilberforce's revered father could have related how pertinaciously, in former days, church-building was hindered, not by radical and dissenting, but by very different influence; to overcome which was

rarely practicable. In many, if not most instances, a special act of parliament was requisite; and to obtain one, even in extreme cases, was not an easy matter, to say nothing of the labour and expence. Multitudes of the laity were anxious to erect and support new churches, the want of which was severely felt; but they were not allowed to do so. A large portion of the capital expended in dissenting places of worship, and much not in any way called into ecclesiastical action, would have been devoted to this sacred object, had not many of the most influential of those who were called the best friends of the Church, resisted the measure. The venerable Lord Eldon, for instance, and his learned brother, were long among the systematic opposers of church-building, and of other safe and necessary reforms; and this short-sighted and unhallowed policy was avowedly defended on the ground of keeping the Church respectable, and preventing the intrusions of methodism. When the restriction (not the abolition) of pluralities was proposed, the same absurd prejudice was urged as a proxy for argument; it being gravely contended, even in the house of commons, that if the less lucrative livings were not allowed to be held in plurality, they would be of little value as property, and would fall into the hands of "clergymen of a certain class"—this was the approved phrase; and that if the legal and ecclesiastical obstacles in the way of church-building were relaxed, much mischief would ensue, as the popular taste in Christianity (to use a phrase of Dr. Chalmers's) was far from pure; as was proved, it was said, by the preferences shewn in the case of lectureships and proprietary chapels. We allude to these historical facts, merely to shew that if churches were not provided, it was not because there were not many persons anxious to provide them (the number of whom would have incalculably increased, as experience has proved, if due encouragement had been afforded), but because their efforts were checked by artificial difficulties; and that serious inquiry may be made as to whether any impediments still exist, which it were possible to remove. We believe that there are such impediments, especially in regard to what are called the rights, more truly the usurpations, of patronage. It is a monstrous anomaly, because a man holds the legal right to present to a benefice, the church and pastoral attentions of which were sufficient when the parish was formed, that many ages after, when that provision has become insufficient, he should be allowed to interfere with the efforts of Christian liberality to do for the new population what his ancestors or predecessors did for the old, and for doing which they and their representatives for ever were endowed with the right of presentation to the benefice. It is much to be lamented also, that whereas Romanists and Dissenters seldom find much difficulty about sites and so forth, Churchmen are vexatiously hampered with such technical impediments. A beautiful and much-needed church has been lately erected at Tunbridge Wells, to the great delight of all who know the spiritual necessities of that important place of public resort; but mortifying is it to add, that owing, as is alleged, to some impediments in the way of its being consecrated, in consequence of the tenure by which the land is held, it has just been sold by auction to the best bidder. We enter not into the details; but we simply ask, why, if the tenure is such that Romanists or Protestant dissenters can open it, churchmen cannot. It is not a tenure that has prevented its

being knocked down for more than £5000 (we know not to whom); and why might it not have been made a church—if only for a term of years, rather than not at all? Buonaparte overran Europe while the old generals were practising military etiquette.

We will now quote a few passages from Mr. H. Wilberforce's pages. The following principle constitutes the foundation of his work.

"And first, it becomes us to inquire what measures will best harmonize with the ancient and tried principles of the Church. True reformations are not effected by an hasty remodelling of existing institutions, on every call of expediency real or fancied, and without regard to the principles on which they were framed, as the architects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries improved our great national edifices in the taste of their own times. Such a spirit, shallow and unphilosophical when applied to civil and political institutions, cannot without actual profaneness intrude into the sanctuary, where of late it has been but too busy. We must not introduce new principles, but recur to old ones; to those by which the ancient Church originally leavened the whole mass of national heathenism, and afterwards provided against the gradual increase of a neglected and demoralized population in the very heart of Christendom. These things were effected by means of that system which apportioned every part of the Church to diocesan bishops and parochial priests, and in its further development accordingly we must seek a remedy for the evils of our own day."

We concur generally in these observations, which are of great importance in this our restless age: but they require some limitations; for not every thing that is ancient is perfect; indeed nothing human is perfect, and much that is human has been blended, from very early times, with the regulations of every branch of the visible church of Christ; besides which, as all things are not apostolical which are ancient, we need constantly to appeal to Scripture, to enable us to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong; added to all which, the exigences of successive ages may call for new applications of old principles; so that though there were no national schools, lending libraries, church-building societies, or Christian Knowledge societies, exactly upon the plan of those now extant, it does not follow that such institutions are not lawful and useful now; and though spiritually and scripturally a bishop is still what a bishop was in the early days of the church, the individual who holds the office in our national church, is, in many respects, very differently circumstanced; and hence, what happened in the case of Cyprian or Chrysostom, does not always furnish a rule, even should it suggest a principle.

Mr. H. Wilberforce continues:

"The division of labour, and the concentration of responsibility, is a principle entwined with the original constitution of the Church. Every one of Christ's flock has his appointed shepherd, who must give account for his soul. The bishop is bound, either by himself or by those commissioned by him, to oversee every inhabitant of his diocese, the parish priest each of his parishioners. Nor are the services of the laity unappropriated: for, while all are bound together as members of the same Lord, they are more especially united who are committed to the superintendence of the same bishop, and yet more of the same pastor; and the efforts of Christian benevolence in the alleviation of bodily suffering, the education of youth, and the edification of all, are no longer dispersed over a desultory and uncertain range, but are united and concentrated, that with a wise and well-ordered alacrity we may 'bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'"

But alas! this beautiful system of pastoral parochialism has in many places become only an unsubstantial vision.

"How are these provisions of the Church realized in her practical working? It is not too much to say, that in our metropolis and other great cities they are wholly obsolete. These pages, perhaps, may meet the eyes of some, who scarcely know even the name of the parochial minister, to whom, as we have seen, the Church has solemnly entrusted the care of their souls, and of very many whose acquaintance with

him extends little further. And such is not only the case of irreligious persons, or of those who are ill-affected towards the Church; nor is it the result of their own choice; but it is of necessity the condition of great numbers of sincere, devout, and conscientious churchmen. Our actual condition, therefore, presents this startling inconsistency; that while we maintain the importance, and even the necessity, of the parochial system, and while in name we retain it, we have suffered the inhabitants of our cities, in many respects the most important part of our population, to be wholly deprived of its blessings."

Mr. H. Wilberforce does not content himself with vague declamation, but adduces, in proof of his statements, masses of appalling facts derived from various sources. For example:

"From an agricultural, we have become, in a great measure, a commercial and manufacturing people. In many districts, villages have swelled into towns, and towns into mighty cities. The population of several counties has increased with a rapidity unexampled probably in the history of the world, certainly without parallel in any long settled and civilized country. In Lancashire, which contained in the year 1700 one hundred and sixty-six thousand souls, there are now one million three hundred and thirty-six thousand eight hundred and fifty-four. The population, therefore, has been multiplied more than eight times. In the West Riding of Yorkshire again, in parts of Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and several other counties, the process has been, and is, proceeding with no less rapidity. The metropolis, too, has wholly changed its character within the same period. The cities of London and Westminster, it is well known, at no distant period were separated by fields and gardens, and connected chiefly by the Thames. The population swarmed about the great marts of commerce, on the north bank of the river, in parishes astonishingly numerous and subdivided, now abandoned chiefly to warehouses and offices. A little to the west of Temple Bar were the pleasant gardens and houses of the nobility, extending along the Strand of the river, then no crowded street; and in many respects answering to those which may now be seen in the neighbourhood of Brentford and Twickenham. And this is the space which now teems with immortal beings, and which we have neglected to subdivide into new ecclesiastical districts as occasion arose, and as ancient example, and indeed the principle of the parochial system, required. And now the overgrown parishes, which on every side surround the city of London, witness by their rural names against the remissness of a generation, which in so many cases has left under the care of a single pastor a district, which, when sprinkled with villas and cottages, gave him full occupation, and in which every cellar and garret is now the abode of families, whose numbers, by precluding all attempt at due pastoral superintendence, do practically destroy all pastoral responsibility. The parish of "St. Giles in the Fields" contains 36,432 immortal souls; that of "Bethnal Green," 62,018; and yet the former is still entrusted to the care of *three*, and the latter of *four*, parochial clergymen. Nor are these solitary cases: in St. George's in the East there are 38,505, with two clergymen; in St. Leonard's Shoreditch, 33,000, with two; in Stepney, 51,000, with three; in St. Luke's, 46,642, with two; in St. Mary's, Whitechapel, 31,100, with one. And taking an average of thirty-four parishes, we find the proportion of pastors to their flocks to be one to 15,100. Such is the condition of our metropolis. Many of the manufacturing and commercial towns are not much less destitute. In two parishes in Liverpool there are but four clergymen to 34,000 souls; in Macclesfield, three to 23,000; in Oldham, four to 32,000; in Leeds, nine to 71,000; in Sheffield, the same number to 73,000. In other instances we find large districts (not towns, and therefore called villages), where, from the discovery of coal, and other causes, a scattered population has rapidly accumulated; and a flock of ten or fifteen thousand dispersed over a surface many miles in extent, are still entrusted to a single pastor.

"In all these cases our parochial system is little more than a delusion; we retain the name and the form, we call the incumbents the pastors of the whole flock, they are charged by the bishop with the spiritual care of the whole; but in the sight of God and man they are not, and cannot be, responsible for the performance of impossibilities. They are the ministers of their own churches—they are the heads too of a sort of mission, bound to labour according to their power for the spiritual good of the multitudes around them; but to require that they should penetrate the mass, and become personally acquainted with the thousands who compose it, that they should distinguish the several characters of those committed to their care, should warn the careless, should

reprove the gainsayers, should build up the weak, should direct the inexperienced,—in short, that they should duly exercise the pastoral care,—would be extravagant. The people accordingly do not, and cannot, regard them as their appointed pastors. They feel themselves to be as sheep without a shepherd, and have generally no other notion of the very nature of a *parish*, than that it is a district relieving its own poor."

What has been done towards supplying these awful deficiencies? What provision has been made, in default of the parochial system, for the spiritual welfare of the people? Most justly does the curate of Bransgore answer these questions.

"There has been, until very recently, only the erection of proprietary chapels, and the labours of pious individuals and societies. That a considerable amount of good has resulted from these means is unquestionable; without them our state would have been worse than it is; but they are palliatives, not remedies of a disease, which, if not radically cured, must in the end be fatal. If we suffer ourselves to account them an effectual cure, we do but deceive ourselves to our ruin, and change them from a good into an evil. They can but be palliatives, because, from the necessity of the case, they have been directed by an imperfect principle. Chapels have been erected, indeed, and congregations gathered, but no account has been taken of those who remain behind. We have seen only what is done, not what remains undone; and the result has been, that one here, and another there, has been snatched from the surrounding mass of ignorance and profaneness, but the mass itself has remained unleavened. It could not be otherwise. And what has been the consequence? First, that there are thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands, who, although baptized with us into the same body, are not only, as we have seen, without any parochial ministry, and so are not invited to the house of God, and as the Lord commanded, 'compelled to come in from the high ways and hedges;' but for whom, moreover, there is no room, should they desire to come: they cannot, if they would, assemble with their brethren, where Christ has promised that He will be in the midst and will grant their requests; they are aliens of necessity from His Church.

"What number of our fellow-subjects are thus excluded from the common blessings of Englishmen and churchmen, it is as yet impossible to calculate. That they are many hundreds of thousands is certain and notorious. In the absence of accurate statistical information with regard to many parts of England, we may safely infer something from the facts which have been ascertained and made public by the most meritorious labours of the Glasgow Church Building Society, and especially of their secretary, Mr. Collins. Of the population of Glasgow, which amounts to about 240,000, there are (it appears) above 90,000, who from age and circumstances might attend church, but for whom no accommodation could be found in any place of worship whatever, although all, both of the papists and of all Protestant sects, Socinians included, and even of the Jews, should be thronged to the utmost. In this city, therefore, ninety churches at least, for one thousand persons each, would be requisite, in order to offer access to all.

"Such is the state of one district, where inquiries have been made. Have we any reason to believe that the spiritual wants of our own manufacturers are more fully provided? We find that in and round Birmingham there are 101,292 immortal beings, who could not, if they would, attend the house of God. At Leeds, only 14,393 out of 123,393 can find room in the churches. At Manchester, about the same proportion; at Sheffield, one-ninth; at Wolverhampton, one-fifth; and this seems about the average of the great manufacturing towns. In London, meanwhile, there are 34 parishes, in which alone there are 756,754 beyond the capabilities of the existing churches; and, if we calculate that one-half of a city population ought to attend church (an estimate very low in the opinion of those who have most accurately inquired into the habits of a town population), we need church room for 378,477, or more than 378 new churches, for 1000 each, in order to supply the deficiency."

Yet even these are not the only difficulties by which the poor of our cities are excluded from the house of prayer. The sittings, as they are called, are for the most part appropriated to houses or seat-payers; and though there are free seats in the new churches and chapels, the supply is still very scanty.

"It is stated for example by the Lord Bishop of Chichester, that the unappropriated church-room in six towns of that wholly agricultural diocese, will accommodate less than three thousand

out of a population of 26,697. And this is far from an extreme case. In one of these very towns the proportion is but twenty to 4000. In a parish of another agricultural diocese, 'containing 8,083 souls, there is no accommodation for the poor except in the aisles.' When we reflect how reluctantly any man, whether rich or poor, will subject himself to the risk of being ejected as an intruder; we may, in some measure, estimate the degree to which our churches are emptied, by this most unbrotherly and unchristian appropriation."

But added to the insufficiency of free seats, the very name conveys an odious distinction in the house of God; so that many, even of the poorer classes, consider it a degradation to occupy these seats, while, of those who are not exactly poor, but who cannot afford to pay the high charge for pews rendered necessary by the want of adequate endowments, many absent themselves altogether; and it is from this class that the dissenting ranks are chiefly recruited; as the Eclectic Review acknowledges, calling the great body of dissenters a "shopocracy," as distinguished from the two extremes of aristocracy and plebeianism. The "free seat" system is in our view objectionable: for, besides the result just alluded to, experience proves that families seldom frequent divine service regularly, unless they have a fixed place of sitting. To remove these inconveniences, it has been suggested that, instead of free sittings, (except sufficient for strangers, or to meet casualties,) a considerable portion of the seats should be let at very low charges, so as to place them within the reach of the poorest. Mr. Wilberforce thinks this "a vicious principle;" alien to the Gospel, and also to the church, the first rule of which is, "freely ye have received, freely give;" and he adds, that "of all spirits, a haughty independence is surely that which least becomes a sinner in drawing near to the majesty of heaven."

Now we are of opinion, and in this we agree with Mr. Wilberforce, that in many respects the best system is the old one, by which the parish finds church accommodation for all its inhabitants, the church-wardens appointing their proper places. But this does not prevent the necessity of paying for the expences attendant on divine worship; the only difference is that a man pays by a rate on his property, instead of by a pew-rent, which is not a difference of principle, but only of circumstances. Again, it is not contrary to the gospel, but enjoined by it, that the pastor should be maintained by his flock; and though pew-rents are not the best mode of eking out his maintenance, they are not unlawful. The "independence," which Mr. Wilberforce characterises as being haughty and unbecoming a sinner in drawing nigh to the majesty of heaven, is of a very different character; it is the same principle which makes an industrious, virtuous, and religious labourer endeavour to shun pauperism and mendicancy; for though there is nothing disgraceful, either in receiving parish alms, or occupying a free seat at church, if necessity requires it, it is a duty, and a prilege, even for those who are not opulent, to endeavour to provide for their own, and also to assist in supporting works of piety and mercy, according to the injunction of the Apostle, so far as God has prospered them, out of their weekly earnings. Their richer neighbours ought to be bountiful out of their abundance; but the poor man who can give but his two mites, is not exempt from the duty of so doing; nor is it inconsistent with the deepest humility, that he should pay, in the form of a pew-rent, a portion of his share of the expences of public worship.

(*To be continued.*)

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THERE is not much to relate in the shape of political news; but many of the incidents of the day suggest subjects for Christian reflection. The late murder, under the name of a duel, which has engrossed so much of public attention, we would fain hope would lead to a serious determination upon the part of Christian senators, and of the nation, to abolish this inhuman code of honour. Not, indeed, that Mr. Mirfin, or his murderer, or their accomplices (two of whom are justly convicted as abettors of the murder) were more guilty than Mr. Pitt, Mr. Tierney, Lord Castlereagh, Lord Winchelsea, the Duke of Wellington, and hundreds of other persons who have fought duels; or, as respects intention, than the multitudes of those who are prepared to commit the crime whenever occasion offers; but circumstances having directed much of public attention to the occurrence, a favourable opportunity is presented of bringing the weight of reason, of law, of Christianity, we might have said of common sense, to bear upon the question, with a view to the repression of the crime. We have always lamented that Mr. Wilberforce did not follow up his intention of bringing in a bill to suppress the practice, upon occasion of Mr. Pitt's duel, or at least at some subsequent period. Christian principle is stronger in the land than it then was, and we think would effect the object, if wise and pious and reflecting men would turn their best attention to the subject. The Queen, as the fountain of honour, might make duelling a disgraceful offence; incapacitating the offender to bear arms in her service, civil or military; and a court of honour might be formed to decide upon the punctilios which induce men to shed each other's blood, in order that they may not be called cowards. A single member of parliament, of known generous feelings and unblemished character, might ultimately succeed in abolishing the crime, if he took up the question in a befitting manner. Why might not the "Christian Influence Society" consider of this matter?

Ireland, under Mr. O'Connell's sway, is preparing for new scenes of agitation; and even the Tithe-law, just settled, is to be made a popular grievance; the object being avowed to strip the Church of its revenues. If the landlords of Ireland fall into this snare, in order to relieve their estates, they will soon find that their rent-roll is not more secure than the rent-charge of tithe. It is consoling to find Mr. O'Connell hostile to almost all England, Tories, Whigs, Radicals, Churchmen—all but Protestant political Dissenters—because they will not abet his schemes of injustice and spoliation. It shews that public principle is not yet extinct among us; and while this predominates, we fear not the issue. Can he wonder that the mass of those of his unhappy countrymen, who are under the sway of Popery, are accounted a public nuisance in the world; when he sees their turbulent and criminal conduct, not only in Ireland, but wherever they go—as, for example, in Canada, in the United States of America; and to complete the climax, in Newfoundland, where Irish priestcraft is endeavouring to become rampant over law and civilization, and to expel Protestantism at the point of the bayonet. Even our English Radicals begin to see enough of the effects of Irish Popery, to perceive that what is called justice for Ireland, is injustice and degradation to Great Britain.

We have almost every month to notice new encroachments upon the sanctity of the Lord's Day. The Sunday desecrations at Windsor, under the auspices of the court, are particularly afflicting: and a select committee of the House of Commons has recommended that the principal General Post office, and every branch post-office in London, should be open on Sunday for the reception of letters, and also, during certain hours, for their delivery; and that the mail-bags should be despatched to and from London on every day of the week. Thus between business on the one hand, and pleasure on the other, the day of holy rest is being entrenched upon on every side. Surely the faithful in the land ought to redouble their efforts to prevent these national transgressions.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

H. W. W.; Y. Z.; G. H.; Un Frère; E. E.; F. S.; E. G.; R. V.; A Gentile Israelite; E. T; J. C.; F. S.; J. H.; P. D. L.; C. W.; W. B. S.; W. P. S.; and J. W.; are under consideration.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. } No. 11. NOVEMBER. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ON THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN your Number for May, a correspondent, bearing the signature of Paulinus, propounds several objections to the literal restoration of the Jews to their own land, to which he requests a clear and satisfactory reply. I will endeavour to answer them in the order arranged by him, with perspicuity, and beyond dubitation to my own mind, but in that spirit and temper which the late Mr. Newton recommends in controversy, by the illustration of Bartimeus, who, when his eyes were opened, did not, says Mr. Newton, take a stick and beat every blind man he met. As you hesitate to admit too prolix articles on any one given subject into your circumscribed pages, I shall curtail as much as possible my ideas upon a question which would otherwise admit of more diffuse argumentations. Though another of your correspondents has already preceded me in replying to these objections, it will be a satisfaction to me to add my Christian testimony in conjunction with him.

Objection 1. "*Because unsupported by the New Testament.*"

It is correct, that there are not in the New Testament any very explicit and positive statements relative to Jewish restoration; but they are sufficiently plain to be accredited by those who admit the authenticity of the Old Testament. The proof of the one, however, is inferentially decisive and corroborative of the other, which is undeniable. In like manner, infant baptism, church government, and even family worship, are not so lucidly described, and unalterably enjoined, in the New Testament, that they have not given rise to endless and frequently fruitless discussions; and yet no Christian man can doubt that Christ intends that his church should have a visible and outward form upon earth, though he has freed it from the imperative ordinances of the Mosaic economy. The old dispensation was more one of the letter, and the new dispensation is one of the spirit. There is no discrepancy or incoherency between the two, but a beautiful coincidence, a harmony; and Scripture ought not, therefore, to be studied by the perusal of dislocated passages, but as one comprehensive whole.

Objection 2. "*Because at variance with the genius of Christianity.*"

Why should the literal restoration of the Jews to their own land be inimical to Christianity? All degrees of order and rank among mankind are not superseded by the Christian religion, nor national distinctions. There exist, at this day, various nations which are as much diversified as before the Christian era, and more; and which, since they have, some of them, professed the faith of the Gospel, have not thereby, except by occasional and individual intermarriages, amalgamated themselves with the inhabitants of other countries; nor have they adopted the same language, except in the cases just alluded to. Much more, the Jews have been the aboriginal and select people of Jehovah, and if they are still preserved a distinct people by a particular Providence, it is an argument à priori and à fortiori from fact, without reference to revelation, that they will still remain such after they shall have been converted, or at all events that as such they shall be restored. It is true, that they vaunted themselves upon their national privileges; and to confound their preposterous pride, they were reminded that God from the very stones could raise up children to Abraham; yet our Lord was himself a Jew; his Apostles after their conversion continued Jews; and St. Paul, though in the foolishness of boasting, recites the privileges of his nation.

Objection 3. "*Because the allusions in the New, to the language of the Old Testament, and the use made of those allusions, are opposed to it.*"

I am not aware that any of the numerous quotations in the New Testament from the Old, made both by our Lord himself, and his Apostles, whether taken from the Hebrew text or from the Septuagint, literally or paraphrastically, are in any instance adverse to the national restoration of the Jews. The reader will find them selected and arranged in Mr. Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures. I admit that there may be no very direct allusion to that event, except it be, as has been before remarked, in inferential terms, or in the apocalyptic and figurative language of prophecy. Such passages as the following for example, bear an import in favour of my position. In Matthew v. 35, our Lord calls *Jerusalem* "the city of the great king." In Luke i. 32, 33, the annunciation of the angel to the mother of our Lord is to this effect: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his *father David*, and he shall reign over the *house of Jacob* for ever." Again, in Luke xix. 11, 12, we read, "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to *Jerusalem*, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should *immediately* appear. He said therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country, *to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.*" Again, Luke xxii. 28—30, "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations, and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging *the twelve tribes of Israel.*" When the disciples, after our Lord's resurrection, inquired of him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom unto Israel?" Christ takes for granted the certainty of the fact itself, and only checks their rashness in regard to the interpretation of the precise period. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." (Acts i. 6, 7.) The angels also testified the same event in the 11th verse of this chapter: "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven." In Rev. xvi. 12,

the Jewish nation is described under the metaphor of the "kings of the east," and their approaching restoration is consequent upon the dissolution of the Turkish empire.

The term Alleluia likewise is a Hebraism, which forms the song of the saints at the fall of Antichrist. (Chap. xix.) The names also of the twelve tribes of Israel, and the Apostles of the Lamb, are inscribed upon the city of the new Jerusalem. (Chap. xxi.)

Objection 4. "*Because there are phrases, terms, and passages in the old Testament, which cannot be taken literally, or without qualification, and which yet have an equal claim to be so taken with the phraseology adduced in support of a literal restoration, while the literal meaning of others is negatived, some by New Testament authority, and some by the mode of their collation, or by the sense expressly attached, or otherwise attaching, to them.*"

What the phrases, terms, and passages are in the Old Testament, which cannot be taken literally, or which are negatived by the New Testament, the objector not having specified, it is not my province or purpose to adduce; nor if such can be found, would they at all gainsay, in my opinion, the literal signification of the undermentioned verses, among many others, which are absolutely unequivocal and unanswerable, and which are impossible to be applied to the deliverance of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity.

"Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea, when the waves thereof roar; the Lord of hosts is his name: If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, *then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever.* Thus saith the Lord, If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel, for all that they have done, saith the Lord." (Jer. xxxi. 35, 36, 37.)

Again, "Behold, I will gather them *out of all countries* whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again *unto this place,* and I will cause them to dwell safely." (Jer. xxxii. 37.)

Objection 5. "*Because there was only one prophet, Malachi, after the last reformation of Nehemiah, until the Christian era, and he does not predict any future deliverance of the Jewish nation; thus leaving us to conclude, that the predictions of the former prophets were fulfilled, as to their literal import, on the return from Babylon, and the subsequent prosperity; and therefore had no reference to the present dispersion.*"

Why the Holy Spirit has not judged it needful so definitively to foretel, by the mouth of Malachi, the future literal promises to the Hebrew nation, can only with reverence be concluded from the superabundant evidence which has been afforded of their truth by the predecessors of that prophet. The tendency, however, of this whole prophecy, is to establish others. It is descriptive of the sins of the people, interspersed with judicial denunciations and evangelical predictions; which language is a refutation in itself of the very assertions made by the objector, that the former prophecies were at that time fulfilled relating to the temporal and spiritual prosperity of the Jews. After referring to the advents of the Messiah, he declares, "Then shall *the offering of Judah and Jerusalem* be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years." (Chap. iii. 4.)

Objection 6. "*Because the doctrine is encumbered with certain difficulties, which are not necessary to be encountered, because obviated by an interpretation more simple and more in harmony with the general tenor of the word of God, than that upon which the said doctrine is built.*"

The difficulties are of three kinds:—

1. Arising from the magnitude of the events necessarily implied.
2. Arising from the ordinary course of things.
3. Arising from the apparent contradiction of Scripture testimony which the doctrine involves.

When difficulties are spoken of in respect to the Divine proceedings, the simplest answer is, that with God all things are possible. But, speaking after the manner of men, great unquestionably as the event will be of Israel's restoration, I conceive that it may be effected partly by human instrumentality; nor are we to neglect the Scriptural and rational means for the spiritual conversion of the Jews, though I doubt not that the Lord will interfere personally, miraculously, or by some visible judgment, in behalf of his ancient people, as in their former exodus from Egypt. Their rise, progress, establishment, and dispersion as a nation, have been marvellous from the beginning, and so will be their future recovery from national bondage, which is in strict accordance with the declarations of holy writ.

Objection 7. "*Because the doctrine is fruitless of good, and prolific of bad, effects on the public mind in general, and on the minds of the Jews in particular.*"

Whatever the Lord has revealed, as a legitimate consequence, cannot be otherwise than productive of good. The accompanying evil can be only attributable to man. He works all things for his own glory, and includes therein the prosperity of his church, and the felicity of his creatures. The doctrine in question tends to strengthen the faith of the Jews in particular, and of Christians in general; while the nations of the world are absorbed in their own intellectual, sensual, or mere secular pursuits, and in their own blindness and unbelief will become the sinful and unwilling agents in accomplishing the Divine decrees, till they shall be awakened and alarmed by the very event; and many among them, we may pray and hope, will be saved in the great day of the Lord. F. S.

*** We have received various other papers on this subject; but the above discusses the objections of Paulinus in the most full and regular manner. W. P. S. says, with much candour, that Paulinus has altogether mistaken the intention and application of his expressions respecting unfulfilled prophecy; for that when he said that the pride and presumption of men have opposed more hindrances to the study of this, than perhaps of any other part of God's word, he spoke only generally, and without the slightest reference to any individual. He adds:—

"Have we not seen with sorrow, how the Church of Christ has been harassed and divided on this subject? Are we not living witnesses that men, having applied themselves to the interpretation of unaccomplished predictions, have therefrom endeavoured to extract false doctrines, and even damnable heresies;—raising up new systems, subversive (if such a thing could be subverted) of the faith once delivered to the saints, and striking at the root of those truths for which the blood of the noble army of Martyrs was poured out? This was simply my meaning; and this rashness, this 'pride and presumption,' of man—for by what more appropriate names can we call it?—has made unfulfilled Scripture ground on which many fear to tread. It is indeed a subject to be entered upon with prayer, diffidence, and caution. Scaliger has called Calvin a wise man for not commenting on the Apocalypse; and Voltaire hinted that

Newton was a weak one, because he did so. South, with his usual quaintness, once said, that the study of prophecy either found a man mad, or made him so. But in opposition to this, we have the encouragement, 'Blessed is he that readeth;' we have the promise, 'The wise shall understand!' It was the remembrance of this encouragement and promise that made me express my satisfaction when Paulinus advised a 'temperate, scriptural, and brotherly discussion' of some of the interesting questions connected with the subject. He will, I am sure, believe me when I say, that I had no intention of assuming an unkind or arrogant tone towards him, nor the remotest idea that he would or could so misconstrue me. Indeed, though I know not who he may be, of this one thing I am certain, that a sense of my own weakness and ignorance would deter me from assuming such a tone towards any person."

This candid statement will probably satisfy J. H., who complains with Paulinus of the manner in which some of the advocates for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, the personal reign of Christ upon earth, and other controverted conclusions from unfulfilled prophecy, treat the arguments of their brethren. J. H. says, "I have long felt it to be of little avail to reason with men who set out with the assumption of their own infallibility on the question, and then, in support of this claim, quote numerous texts which were manifestly fulfilled at the return of the Jews from Babylon;" but he will see, that though W. P. S. has a very decided opinion, he does not lay claim to "infallibility." J. H. adds,—

"Besides an array of texts that either do not bear upon the subject, or are of doubtful application, we are sometimes encountered with a list of names. Is it intended that such a question may be settled by an appeal to human authority? If so, we should have no objection to apply to all divines of any reputation in the Church of Christ; and we feel persuaded that the majority of sound sober-minded students and expounders of God's word, would be found to favour the views of Paulinus."

Another correspondent, who subscribes himself A GENTILE ISRAELITE, and who considers that the restoration of the Israelitish nation will be "a distinct and visible terrene manifestation to all men of blessed and blessing righteous church and state polity," writes:—

"I have read with interest the short and effective remarks of Paulinus. His observations as to the manner in which a clergyman would be received at the the public meetings, is, I think, partly true and partly incorrect. What he states is true, because one or two clergymen have not courage enough to take the part which conscience and duty seems to enforce upon them at such meetings—namely, to resist that sensitive and dishonourable feeling which subdues every voice that ventures to lift up itself in opposition to the prescribed course of proceeding at such meetings. Let any one or more clergymen combine to meet and support some resolution (at the next Jews meeting, or at a *special meeting*) involving the very point of terrene restoration, or otherwise, and let him do this on the ground that to give a wrong direction to the faith, and feelings, and wealth of Christians, on this or any other professedly religious subject, is fatal to spiritual improvement, and personal prosperity, and peace in life; or let him introduce his motion as an amendment on some of the silly resolutions of laudation which too often form part of the proceedings of our meetings, and if he introduce himself and his object to the meeting in the professed and real spirit of a Christian, no platform would be able to suppress the determination of the meeting to listen to him. As a subscriber to the Society he would be entitled to be heard, to say nothing else. I however by no means intend to imply that public meetings at Exeter Hall, or elsewhere, are the suitable places for the discussion of such subjects—especially entirely open meetings. I have often lamented that a subject of such importance should be huckstered, so to speak, by a mere fraction of the Church. It is a subject to be considered of by the choicest Christians of every name, in retired and peaceful association in the presence of those who desire patiently to hear the subject mooted for their own edification, and that they may know what they are doing by their professed religious movements: for, on the right understanding of this subject, perhaps (as I believe to be the case) do all present and future movements of the churches properly depend. The truth is, the fault lies with men

like Paulinus, who have the ability to address themselves to public, or to public-private (to use a parliamentary phrase) audiences, that they indolently or fearfully acquiesce in the meagre arrangements of our money-getting meetings. There are hundreds who would sit patiently for hours to hear a well ordered consideration of so important a subject as that referred to by Paulinus; but they are now feasted with the really inane matter of reiterated partialities or demonstrable absurdities. The religious public would, I am convinced, much prefer the entire time of these meetings being occupied by practical subjects, such as that of the terrene or other restoration of the Jews, to the threadbare wearisome declamation which constitutes the staple of our (partly) miscalled religious assemblies. Surely to talk error, or covetousness, or untruth, is not religious. Do not suppose me as undervaluing these assemblages; but there is no society perhaps more open to these observations than the Jews' Society, because its object is the *most profoundly interesting and extensive*, and would bear the most patient and gifted and delightful consideration. I have, probably, expressed myself more hastily or strongly than I ought to have done, but not more sincerely than the facts of the case admit of. Paulinus truly says, the point is to determine what is future and what is fulfilled."

We have given as full a sample as our limits allowed of the papers of our correspondents. Several have favoured us with extracts from various commentators and writers on prophecy, which we have not space for. We conclude with the following practical remarks furnished by J. H. from the sermons of the late Rev. W. Howells.

"In Hebrews, viii. 12, the apostle evidently dwells on blessings common to Jews and Gentiles. He says nothing to the Jews of returning to their own land. It is remarkable that this prince or monarch of divines, taught the Jews what was of immediate necessity, the very truths they then wanted. In their extreme degradation it would probably have been very gratifying for them to hear that they were to return to Jerusalem; but not a syllable does the apostle tell them of this. He dwells on those truths which were absolutely necessary then to keep their souls alive, and in union and communion with Deity. Not that we are to be inattentive to future blessings, for there are such; *but whether we think of happiness, present or future, let it be spiritual.* We shall know the Lord, and reign with him—we shall not only be renewed in the spirit of our minds, but in our bodies likewise. The remission of sins is the great blessing of which both Jews and Gentiles stand in need. Another necessarily connected with it, is justification by faith. Faith only justifies as it receives the blessing freely and fully at the hands of God."—(Howell's Sermons, Vol. i. p. 89).

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE TUMULT AT EPHESUS.

(Acts xix. 23—41.)

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In the view commonly entertained of the transaction recorded in this portion of Scripture (the tumult at Ephesus), the actors are considered as simply a promiscuous and riotous mob; acting not only illegally, but with no cloak or semblance of lawful authority. The clamour and violence displayed on the occasion, undoubtedly accord well with this supposition: but a close attention to the language of St. Luke (which, even in our translation, has a classical air not common in Scripture) has led the writer of these remarks to a somewhat different conclusion; which it is his object, in the present communication, to submit for the consideration of your critical readers.

It is well known that the Romans, in the administration of conquered provinces, adopted the obvious policy of preserving the native tribunals and other institutions of their subjects: though under such restrictions as rendered them compatible with the absolute authority of a Roman Governor. This system, indeed, is so natural, and so usual in the case of permanent conquests not attended with the extermination of

the vanquished, that it is scarcely necessary to establish the probability of its existence in particular instances. How extensively it was acted upon in Judea, must be apparent to the least reflecting reader of the New Testament; and the preservation of the court of Areopagus is an instance of the adoption of the same policy under circumstances precisely parallel to those of Ephesus, and occurring, politically speaking, in the same country.

Bearing in mind these facts, it seems not unreasonable, when the technical terms of a Grecian constitution occur in a narrative of transactions happening in a Grecian city, to inquire whether such terms are not to be understood in the sense which they ordinarily bear in the Greek historians. A translation made on this principle is subjoined, as the simplest way of exhibiting the writer's view of the subject: the word εκκλησια, importing the general democratic assembly of the privileged or free citizens, being retained; and δημος, for want of a better word, being rendered by "burgesses." "For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, who manufactured silver shrines of Diana, afforded no little employment to the workmen. And calling together them, and other workmen of the same kind, he said," &c. "And the whole city was filled with confusion, and dragging with them Gaius and Aristarchus, Paul's companions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre." [The place where the ecclesia met was usually so called.] "Now on Paul's desiring to go in unto the burgesses, the disciples would not permit him. And certain Asiarchs also [probably Greek magistrates, so called] who were friendly to him, sent to him, and begged that he would not venture into the theatre. Now some cried one thing, and some another; for the ecclesia was in confusion, and the greater part did not know the occasion of their meeting. And they drew forth Alexander from among the multitude, the Jews putting him forward; and Alexander waved his hand, and endeavoured to make a defence before the burgesses. But when they learned that he was a Jew, they all cried with a loud voice," &c. "But the Recorder [the officer, probably, whose duty it was to preside in the ecclesia, or minute down its proceedings] having pacified the multitude, said, 'Ephesians' [Ανδρες Εφεσιοι, answering to the Ανδρες Αθηναιοι of Demosthenes], 'who is there that knows not,' &c. 'If, then, Demetrius and his workmen have ground of complaint against any person, court days are holden, and there are deputies [or Proconsuls], let them sue each other. But if ye are making inquisition about other matters, they shall be settled in the lawful ecclesia. For we are liable to a charge of sedition for what has happened to-day; there being nothing on which we can report as a just cause of this assemblage.' And having thus spoken, he dissolved the ecclesia."

The last verses shew conclusively that there was at this time, in Ephesus, a legal assembly called the ecclesia, having some powers of deliberation and adjudication; respecting which we can only say, that they seem not to have extended to the settlement of private suits, and that we may be sure they were so guarded as not to interfere with the authority of the Roman magistrates. If this point be conceded, the language of the town clerk or recorder, and the strong expression of St. Luke, "he dissolved the ecclesia," almost compel the inference that the tumultuous assemblage here described, was, in truth, an informal and irregular meeting of an assembly, having the name, and being the representative, of the once formidable ecclesia.

The technical meaning given to δημος in the proposed translation, derives some countenance from its use in Acts xvii. 5. We are there told that the unbelieving Jews, and others, made an assault on Jason's house, and sought to bring out the inmates *unto the people*—αυτους αγαγειν εις τον δημον. Any party of rioters, strong enough to force an entrance, might have wreaked their fury on the disciples within the house, as easily as outside: it is, therefore, more intelligible to suppose that their object was rather to drag them before the δημος, that is, the burgesses assembled in ecclesia.

A farther confirmation of the correctness of the views explained above, may perhaps be found in St. Paul's supposed reference to the transactions at Ephesus, 2 Cor. i. 4—10. Paley, in his Horæ Paulinæ, seems to acknowledge that the language of St. Paul, respecting the extent and urgency of the danger to which he was, on this occasion, exposed, is stronger than the account given by St. Luke would have induced us to expect. There is, certainly, some ground for this observation, if the view usually taken of the tumult at Ephesus is correct. But the difficulty vanishes, if we consider the ecclesia, whose conduct is recorded by the sacred historian, as a body, formidable indeed from physical force, but doubly formidable as the depository of all that was remaining of the sovereignty of the Ephesian people. This supposition, moreover, explains St. Paul's desire to make his appearance in the theatre, which otherwise seems rash, and scarcely consistent with the state of feeling depicted in the epistle. Dr. Paley, indeed, attributes it to "distraction of mind;" but it is more satisfactory to consider it as springing out of an apprehension that a vote of condemnation might be passed upon him in his absence. It may be objected that such a vote would have been a nullity, as the meeting was illegal; but the sentence, if once passed, would probably have been confirmed, as a matter of course, "in the lawful assembly;" that is to say, at a meeting of the ecclesia, held on the stated day, and with the formalities required by law: or the Roman governor, with whom doubtless the ultimate authority rested, might have looked to the spirit rather than the form of the proceedings, and have lent his sanction; which, even supposing flight possible, would have been equivalent to an outlawry in force throughout the civilized world.

Besides the passages already quoted, the word δημος occurs in Acts xii. 22, in connexion with the classical verb δημηγορεω; but with no distinct indication of a technical meaning. Yet as the exclamation by which the people testified their approval of Herod's address (δημος επεφωνει) more resembles the adulation of an obsequious senate, than the extravagance of a mob; and as the occasion was one when the intervention of a promiscuous multitude would scarcely be permitted (unless, indeed, such a custom survived the extinction of popular assemblies), it is probable, even here, that δημος retains some tinge of its classical meaning, though more evanescent and shadowy than in the previous instances.

The words λαος and οχλος are of common occurrence in the New Testament; but the use of δημος, so far as the writer is aware, is confined to the passages considered above. It is for critics to decide how far the context of these passages, or the political state of the world at the date of the Acts of the Apostles, renders it necessary to annex a meaning to the term, not in accordance with its ordinary signification at an earlier period. U. U. S.

"OUR MOST RELIGIOUS AND GRACIOUS QUEEN."

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It is a most weighty prayer which our church presents to Almighty God, humbly beseeching Him, as for this kingdom in general, so especially for the High Court of Parliament, under our most religious and gracious Queen assembled. What an important view is here set before us to give earnestness to our prayers, that the reigning monarch may be most religious and gracious! For then what incalculable benefits will flow, through the Royal connexion with the High Court of Parliament, to the kingdom in general.

The Divine rule of procedure will make Christians devoutly desire, that this descriptive character of our beloved Queen may shine forth in royal brightness; because God has declared, what will be fulfilled, "Them that honour me I will honour; but they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." There may be frivolity and gaiety in the manners and conversation of many who frequent a court, and much thoughtlessness or irreligion in other quarters; but the sound portion of the population of the British empire entertain sentiments in accordance with this rule of the Divine procedure; so that, if an irreligious monarch, regardless of the honour due to God, should ever sit on the British throne, no power on earth could prevent a lamentable decline of affection toward such a monarch, and towards the monarchy, and the pillars of aristocracy, its nearest supporters; indeed, the aristocracy would be deteriorated and disesteemed by their very attendance on an irreligious monarch. On the other hand, the population of Great Britain are the very population who best know the value of that descriptive character of a British monarch, most religious and gracious; and no population will more esteem, and support with unchangeable attachment, a religious and gracious Queen. Their great desire is, that a reigning monarch may honour God, and rule by his word. I do not of course mean that the mass of our people are actuated by scriptural principles; but blessed be God multitudes of them are; and the influence of these extends to others; and in general, in consequence of the national recognition of Christianity, and the wide diffusion of the Holy Scriptures, and of Christian instruction, and Divine ordinances, there is a conventional respect for religion, and a belief that God directs the affairs of empires; and that wicked rulers bring down curses upon nations.

Not many months since an ex-chancellor extolled the royal mother of our most gracious queen, because an excellent education had been given to her Majesty. That indefatigable individual is ardently labouring to diffuse what is called (exclusively), "useful knowledge" through the land; but Christians will not agree with mere philosophical views of the education which is best suited for the well-being of a people. They will desire such an education as shall impress upon men a regard for the infallible rule, above cited, of the Divine Government, "Them that honour me I will honour." Christians will indeed desire a wide diffusion of useful secular knowledge; but they will endeavour, that men may be trained to seek first the honour which comes from God, the blessing of God, in time and in eternity.

Those who are advocates for the diffusion of "useful knowledge"

chiefly, profess to aim at a praise-worthy end, the civilization of the ignorant; but not aiming first to promote the glory of God they neglect the revealed means of securing even this secular blessing. This is well shewn by the Rev. Henry Melvill, who thus expresses himself on this subject: "The great engine of civilization is still the written word of the Most High. And if you visit a tribe of our race in the lowest depths of barbarism, and desire to bring up the debased creatures, and place them on their just level in the scale of existence, it is not by the enactments of earthly legislation, any more than by the tyrannizings of earthly might, that you may look to bring speedily round the wished-for result. The effective machinery is Christianity, and Christianity alone. Propagate the tenets of this religion, as registered in the Bible, and a mighty regeneration will go out over the face of the long degraded community."

Must we not then earnestly desire, with our church, that the descriptive character of the reigning monarch, most religious and gracious, may ever be realized on the British throne? Then the knowledge of the Scriptures will be royally and nationally promoted, and Christianity will become an effective engine of civilization. Then, also, the royal veneration for Christianity will appear in honouring those, who regard sincerely, and endeavour earnestly to impress upon the people, those Christian principles which not only secure civilization, but far higher benefits, when an eternal state of being is brought into the account.

But even respecting the aim of those who desire the diffusion of secular useful knowledge, as a means of temporal advantage to the people, the words of the pious and eloquent preacher above mentioned deserve to be cited. "We contend, that the revolution effected in temporal affairs, should win even from those who prize not its disclosures in regard to eternal, the warmest admiration for the Bible. Where Christianity has by faithful men been introduced, there has succeeded to lawlessless and violence the beautiful scenery of good order and peace. The rude beings, alternately the prey and scourge of neighbouring tribes, have settled down to the quiet occupations of industry; and, gathering themselves into villages, and plying the business of handicraft and agriculture, have presented the aspect of a well disciplined society, in exchange for that of a roving and piratical horde. And when a district, which has heretofore, both morally and physically, been little better than a desert, puts forth in all its outspread the tokens of a vigorous culture; and the Sabbath-bell summons from scattered cottages a smiling population, linked together by friendship, and happy in all the sweetnesses of domestic charities; why the infidel must be something less than a man, if, with all his contempt for the Bible, as a revelation from God, he refuse to admire and esteem it as a noble engine for uplifting humanity from its deep degradation."

Let us earnestly hope and pray, that our most religious and gracious Queen may give all her Royal influence, in due time, to the culture of these Christian truths, through the whole length and breadth of the extended British empire. When this influence from the throne is thus decisive, in behalf of the only sure means of promoting true civilization, in connexion with the eternal benefits flowing from Christianity; then only will the petitions of our church be answered: "that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and

piety, may be established among us." Those who advocate an education of secular knowledge chiefly, may have strong expectations and imaginations of benefits to be conferred by scientifically enlightening an ignorant people; but our church certainly looks for these and all needful blessings to our population, when the High Court of Parliament, under our most religious and gracious Queen assembled, are led, by the blessing of God, to consultations which may first promote his glory; then the good of the church, as an instrument of good from Him; whence will follow the safety, honour, and welfare of our sovereign and her dominions. The excellent preacher, before quoted, thus exalts a scriptural education as the best means of rightly cultivating men's minds: "But if a population could be made a Bible-reading population, we argue, that it would be made a far more intelligent population than it will ever become through the turning its attention on simplified sciences and abbreviated histories. The bringing men to study the Bible would be going a vast deal further towards making them strong-minded and intellectual, than the dispersing amongst them treatises on all the subjects which philosophy embraces. The Bible, while the only book for the soul, is the best book for the intellect."

It is cheering to know, that by such training, these real benefits have been conferred on a portion of the population of Great Britain. The Rev. Dr. Lee, in his examination on the Sabbath Bill, before a Committee of the House of Commons, speaks as follows respecting the Lowlands of Scotland, at a period which soon followed the Reformation. "So great was the diffusion of the Scriptures in the Lowlands, where, forty years before, the Bible was not suffered to be read, that almost every house possessed a Bible, and had the Bible read in it. There was scarcely an individual in the Lowlands who could not read, and who was not in the habit of reading the Bible; and scarcely a family, in which the worship of God was not regularly performed. That was the period certainly when the Sabbath was most strictly observed, and when the morals of the people were the most healthy."

When the principles and morals of a people are thus scriptural, a most important benefit will result from the "prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks," which will be made "for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty." I know not what others may see and know on this head, as to loyal attachment to our monarch, from those who are diffusers of useful science chiefly; but experience has shewn me, that many who take a lead in this diffusion, are puffed up by this knowledge, to speak evil of dignities, and to desire that a republic may be raised upon the ruins of the monarchy of Great Britain. I speak on this head, deliberately, from painful experience.

In the second volume of Luther's works we have his expositions of the Epistles and Gospels, from the first Sunday in advent, dedicated to Frederic the Elector, Duke of Saxony. He addresses Frederic as a religious and gracious prince, "Illustrissime princeps, qui sacris literis incomparabili studio et faves et inhias." This is a proof that Frederic had received an excellent education. Luther says, that this prince had counselled him to lay aside his contests, and to apply

himself to sacred and peaceful studies; whence we have these expositions: "Judicasti tu, optimo quidem consilio, ut posthabitis rixosis, mordacibus, et turbulentis scriptionibus, quibus jam tertium annum perdidi, sacris et placidis studiis inservirem, et juxta Psalteri elucidandi laborem," &c. Luther accorded with the wishes of his prince, who, by his knowledge of the Scriptures, procured such teaching and writing as would best promote truly Christian principles in his people. We may see here in what manner Frederic would have acted in dispensing such patronage as is possessed by an English chancellor. And as he recalled Luther to studies and writings free from controversy, perhaps, had Dr. Hook preached before him, he might have given him the advice which he gave to Luther; and our most religious and gracious Queen might have heard more fully an exposition of the only way of justification through faith in Jesus Christ; which doctrine impressed upon her Majesty's heart, with all its practical effects, in the striking manner of Dr. Hook, might be a blessing through a most important life, and bring important benefits, through her Royal influence, to her affectionate subjects.

A Queen of England has been placed, before the present, in very critical and perilous times; and that Queen's ministers were such, that this empire will not soon look upon their like again. May our beloved Queen, in these difficult times, attain to the character thus pronounced upon Queen Elizabeth, of blessed memory—(See the words of Sandys, at York, quoted by Strype, on the Reformation, under Queen Elizabeth, p. 161),—"She is the very patroness of true religion, rightly termed, The Defender of the Faith: one that before all other things seeketh the kingdom of God. If the threatenings of men could have terrified her, or their allurements enticed her, she had revolted long ere this: so fiercely by great potentates her constancy hath been assaulted. But God hath strengthened his Royal handmaid. The fear of God hath put to flight the fear of man. Her religious heart is accepted of the Lord, and glorious it is also in the eyes of the world. A princess zealous for God's house; so firmly settled in his truth, that she hath constantly determined, rather to suffer torments, than one jot to relent in matter of religion."

An ardent desire for the well-being and true happiness of our beloved sovereign has prompted these thoughts; and it is hoped, that they will be kindly received and followed by the fervent petitions of all Christians, that our youthful Sovereign may be long blessed to us.

J. H.

*** Our correspondent has derived very excellent instruction from the epithets applied in our service to the reigning monarch; but in order to prevent misconception we ought to add, that they are used of the official and not necessarily of the personal character of the sovereign. So long as a monarch rules in justice and mercy, and according to law, and upholds the national ordinances of religion, the epithets "religious and gracious" may be officially applied to him without reference to his private character, of which the great bulk of his subjects can know little or nothing but by mere rumour. Without some such explanation we should scruple to apply these epithets promiscuously to all our monarchs in succession; and even with it, we wish the passage had been so worded as to prevent misconception.

ON THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

No person can be surprised at the powerful effects which have been produced by the appalling disclosures respecting the confessional in the Church of Rome, made in various recent publications, and in addresses at public meetings. The chief wonder is that the results have not been much greater; for who that seriously considers the inevitable abuses which must arise from auricular confession, as practised in the Church of Rome, but must feel surprised that the veriest devotees of that corrupt church are not sensible of them; or that any man can willingly allow a wife, or daughter, or sister, or female friend, to be subjected to the contaminations, not to be named, of this secret tribunal of inquisition. Whether we read Dens or any other papal canonist or casuist; whether we argue the question à priori from the corrupt tendencies of human nature; whether we appeal to the concurring testimonies of history, or to the proverbial jealousies of husbands, fathers, and brothers, in those Roman catholic countries in which the habits of the priests, and the actual system of monasteries, nunneries, and confessionals are best known, such as Italy, Spain, and Portugal; whether we refer to the repeated papal decrees and other ordinances which have been enacted against the desecration of the confessional to the purposes of vice; or whether we refer to the testimony of those who, having escaped from the thraldom of popery, have recorded facts which came within their own knowledge while subject to it,—we can arrive at but one conclusion, that a practice more tending to profligacy was never invented by the arts of Satan, or the corrupt imagination of mankind.

The difficulty is to get either Protestants, or the better disposed sort of Romanists, sufficiently to understand the system to be aware of its enormities; the former, because the subject is one which cannot with propriety be opened in all its disgusting details in popular tracts or public assemblies; the latter, because early education and long habit have so familiarised the practice to the mind and imagination, and so deeply impressed the awful guilt of concealment, that the true penitent regards the matter as an official transaction, a necessary scrutiny, the sanctity of which glosses over all that is equivocal; while the hypocrite, the hardened, and the thoughtless, get through the ceremony deceitfully, boldly, or carelessly, comforted by the absolution, and thinking little of the moral character of the transaction.

I once heard a Roman catholic lady, the wife of a Protestant gentleman, remark that she was very anxious to induce her son to be regular at confession, as she considered the strict scrutiny of the priest would be a powerful restraint against vice. I am not sure that even in such a case as this, of one young man protruding all his wrong thoughts or acts before another, that the good effects outweighed the bad, or that either party was benefited by the communication; but if instead of her son it had been her daughter, the case would have been far stronger; and I was astonished that my Protestant friend—though an easy sort of self-indulging man, who used no effort to prevent his son following his mother's persuasion—was not somewhat sensitive respecting this "strict scrutiny" in the case of his own wife;

for though she, in her implicit faith, saw no impropriety in disclosing her most secret faults, sins, and feelings to her priest, and had been taught to consider it wicked not to do so, yet had my friend been present at the dialogue, he might not have been perfectly pleased with some of the questions; or have thought that what is right is best upheld by mysterious conversations upon what is wrong.

The spell by which the Church of Rome binds her deluded votaries in the thraldom of the confessional, is the alleged Divine authority of the practice as connected with the pretended sacrament of penance; and the supposed saintly character of the priesthood, who being disunited from the ordinary ties of domestic life, are represented as a sort of unearthly beings, who view all human transactions from a sphere of almost angelic elevation, commixing with mundane affairs only to direct them to holy purposes. But with regard to the first of these arguments, the tribunal of confession, as set up in the Church of Rome, has no warrant of Holy Writ; for though it is said "Confess your sins one to another," and though the discharge of this duty, either publicly or privately, or both, is often essential to peace of mind and to the satisfaction of our neighbour, and conduces to the glory of God; yet there is the widest possible distinction between the humble acknowledgments of a penitent who wishes to repair any injury he may have committed, or to obviate any scandal which he may have caused, and the setting up an ecclesiastical court of moral torture, to probe into the darkest recesses of men's hearts, and to make their salvation depend upon their gratifying the tyrannical, or superstitious, or prurient, curiosity of a frail sinful being like themselves, and one of themselves. And then, as to the supposed sacred character of the Romish priesthood, which sanctifies what otherwise were unholy, where do we find this in Scripture? where do we see it proved in history? where do we discern any tokens of it in daily life? Does not experience prove that the ecclesiastics of Rome are "men of like passions with others;" that they are as proud, as selfish, as covetous, as revengeful, as deceitful, as addicted to sensual indulgence, as their neighbours; and that if their education and course of life impose on them some restrictions, they also afford facilities to many laxities; if they remove some temptations, they open a wide door to others.

I do not doubt that many conscientious Romanist priests endeavour to render the confessional an unmixed good to their penitents; and desire, in the most perplexing investigations to which they consider their duty calls them, to avoid being led into evil, or leading others into it. Nothing can be stronger upon this point than the solemn admonitions of many of the Roman catholic writers, including Dens himself. But the system is not to be judged of by its working in the case of a seriously minded and holy man, who feels the dangers to which he is exposed, and prays and strives against them; and who shuns, as a fearful sin, every temptation to make what professes to be a solemn rite of religion, minister to pride, or avarice, or revenge, or oppression, or licentiousness, or the love of domination. No, it must be judged of by its obvious tendencies, taking human nature as we ordinarily find it, and claiming no exemption in favour of the papal apostacy. A confessor, instead of being a Xavier or a Fenelon, may be a Borgia, a Leo, a Bonner, or a Talleyrand; a man of depraved mind or corrupt morals; profane, dishonest, drunken, or hypocritical;

a Maynooth agitator, a French infidel, or an Italian profligate. It will be replied that such awful anomalies may be found in other ecclesiastical communions. True—though Rome opens the widest door to them;—but other ecclesiastical communions do not invest their officers with the dangerous powers which Rome gives to hers; they regard them as men, and trust them only as men; whereas Rome affects to be raised far above the necessity for such paltry restrictions.

I might have illustrated my remarks by examples, with which history abounds; but on such a subject, it would not comport with the Apostle's directions respecting what is "convenient" to go much beyond a general reference. I may however refer to one of the names above-mentioned, the late M. Talleyrand, because his character is well-known, and because, if the biographical accounts of him are correct, he did not scruple to narrate, as if it were an excellent jest, the purposes to which he was accustomed to apply the confessional. I will venture to refer to one of the alleged extracts which have been published from his letters upon this subject, revolting as it is, because it illustrates what I have before alluded to of the confiding simplicity with which an ingenuous young person goes to the confessional, and which renders it a most dangerous engine, should the priest wish to pervert it to any purpose of avarice, domination, unhallowed curiosity, or licentiousness. Talleyrand, then Abbé de Périgord, shortly before being made bishop of Benevento, writes: "You ask me where I first became acquainted with the young baroness. It was in the temple of the Lord, at the foot of the holy tribunal of penance, that I became covered with the contaminations of sin. She was so simple! From the simplicity of her answers, I perceived I had to deal with a complete novice. Being alone with her at the confessional, I asked her if she loved: [this, according to Dens, is a most proper and necessary question from a confessor to a novice]. Oh yes, she replied, interrupting me, I love my Saviour with all my soul." He goes on to relate, "A few days after she came again to confession, when I put to her a more direct question. I asked her if she loved me. 'Yes,' she replied, 'I love you as the representative of God, as my guide to heaven,' after which she asked for my blessing."

Can one wonder that a man like Talleyrand, having been taught from infancy to identify the Romanist confessional with the religion of the pure and holy Jesus, became an infidel and a scoffer?

It is not necessary to the argument, to prove either the authenticity of this letter, or the truth of the facts. Much has doubtless been attributed to this wicked man which was not his; but even if this letter, which was published long ago in the memoirs of his life, were apocryphal, which I see no reason to surmise, it would at least shew that the confessional is open to such abuses, and no one can doubt that such a wretch as Talleyrand was capable of thus employing it.

But all Romanist priests, it will be said, are not like Talleyrand; a man stained by innumerable vices and crimes; and who did not even veil his profligacy, but gloried in his shame. Certainly not; but the church of Rome makes no moral distinctions in the right to exercise the powers of the confessional; Talleyrand had this prerogative as much as Fenelon; the penitent was bound to answer his questions; and even if he went to the extremity of the fanatic Dens, which, bad as he was, it were uncharitable to think he was so debased as to do, there

was no remedy; nay it might be a sacred duty, according to Romish casuistry, for the confessor to probe into the state of his penitent's feelings towards himself, as thereupon might rest serious matter for confession. So that even had the young baroness, braving all consequences, dared to complain to the Abbé's ecclesiastical superior, of such a question being asked her, under the pretence of a religious inquisition, Talleyrand might have replied that he had reason to think the inquiry requisite in the faithful discharge of his office. In short, the victims of the confessional are delivered into the hands of the priest, bound with the manacles of popish superstition, and blinded by what they consider a light from heaven. Well may Rome, during so many ages, have ruled the world with a rod of iron, when added to all her other machinations, she adds the chains of a pretended sacrament, more powerful than all the terrors of the inquisition.

A PROTESTANT.

ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE attempts which have been lately made by men of rank and influence to separate the National education from the National church, must cause a measure of anxiety in the minds of all who value the blessings of a national faith. The consequences of their success, should they succeed, might not be felt immediately; for, like the marriage and registration acts, it might afford at first a fresh evidence of the rooted attachment of the people of England to the Establishment: but it does not follow, on that account, that its effect would be the less dangerous; for it is a measure intended to operate gradually, and by weaning the affections of the nation from existing institutions, to reduce it progressively to a state of religious anarchy.

It is a question then of no little interest, How may these movements be met? Something must be done. What is it? It seems clear, in the first place, that an effort must be made within the church; and, in the second, that the object of this effort must be to render efficient its existing institutions. It is one of the prevailing opinions of the day, that no wound can be cured without amputation; men had rather destroy than take the trouble to improve; but surely it is the office of the destructive to sweep away the whole machine, while the wise man will endeavour to remove defects. It is a much easier thing to establish a new school, than to bring an old one into good order; but the advantages gained are in most cases more than counterbalanced by the confusion and disunion produced by such a measure. With reference to the National Society, we cannot but think, that some of our most serious clergy have lost sight of this principle. They have seen much that is imperfect in the manner of its instructions, and much that they have deemed erroneous in the matter; and they have adopted the simple course of altogether withdrawing from its connexion. We would not now discuss the wisdom of their past conduct, but we are anxious to make an earnest appeal to those excellent men with reference to the present crisis. We would not attempt to deny the defects of our National schools as at present conducted, but we are anxious that our reverend brethren should do their utmost for

the improvement of the system, before they lend the aid of their high character to its overthrow.

It is probably known to all your readers, that a provisional Committee has been appointed to inquire into the defects of the Society's Schools, and the General Committee have issued a circular expressing their readiness to make any improvements which these gentlemen may suggest. A set of queries has been widely circulated, in which a faithful inquiry is made as to the existing evils. There is apparently no disposition to conceal the truth, but, on the contrary, the Committee court examination as the great means of correcting error. Such an effort for self improvement is enough at once to commend the Society to our support; but the claim becomes yet stronger, when we find that the inquiry is directed to those very points on which the schools have been thought defective, and a reasonable expectation given, that if clergymen will but state their objections, the Society will do its utmost to remove them.

The great subject of complaint has been the plan of teaching in the National schools. Religious knowledge is acquired in them in two ways. By reading the Scripture as a reading lesson, and by learning catechetical books, as Crossman, Lewis, &c.; it being the office of a monitor to take care that these lessons be read and repeated with accuracy. Such a system may work very well when our object is to impart secular knowledge alone; but it completely fails when we endeavour to train a child in the fear of God. It *teaches* a child, but it does not attempt to *train* him. There is nothing like religious influence; and without such influence, bare knowledge is almost worthless. Nay, in many cases it does more harm than good: the boy learns to state the truths of the Gospel, but is never taught their practical application to his own hopes and conduct; and hence he regards it as a theory, instead of "the power of God unto salvation." We would not however condemn the monitorial system, for it is absolutely necessary in large schools; but we want to correct it by the employment of devoted masters, by the constant superintendance of the clergy, and by the efficient Sunday school. We want the gentry and the tradespeople to come forward and labour at the social classes; to teach the children on the Sunday, and visit the parents in the week; to shew an affectionate interest in the boys, and to endeavour, by constant perseverance, to win their hearts to God.

The Committee has long encouraged such a system, but many of the local managers have not attended to their suggestions; and where they have, there has been too often a want of lively interest; and therefore, as the natural consequence, an inefficient school. This point, however, is now made the object of particular attention; an admirable set of questions has been issued as to the general defects of Sunday schools, the best means of procuring qualified teachers, &c.; and if men will but come forward to assist, we may hope, ere long, to see our National schools filling their legitimate office, and spreading a religious influence through the land.

A second and still stronger objection to the National Society, has been founded on the matter of its instructions. No books are admitted except those published by "the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge." Many of these are thought to contain doctrines contrary to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith; and clergymen, having taken a solemn vow to "drive away all erroneous

and strange doctrines contrary to God's word," have felt that they could not conscientiously manage schools, where the children are taught that "the second covenant differs from the first as to the mildness and mercy of it:" because, "Whereas a perfect and unsinning obedience was expected of our first parents upon pain of death; we are only required to use our honest and hearty endeavours to serve God and keep his commandments."—(Crossman's Introduction, p. 36.) We cannot be surprised at such a scruple; we can only wonder that any thing so wholly contrary to the Prayer-book and the Bible should ever have gained admittance into any single school, professing to train its children "according to the principles of the Established Church." Nor do we hesitate to express our opinion, that until some measures are taken to clear the catalogue of such books as Crossman's Introduction, the clergy will never, as a body, so far compromise their principles, as to lend their unqualified support to the National Society. But we are now encouraged to expect a change. In the circular lately issued, we are told that "the Central Committee is prepared to take into its own hands the formation of a list of books of religious and moral instruction, under the direction and with the sanction of its Episcopal members, for the use of schools, in union with the Society, and from time to time to make alterations in such list under the same sanction." Now, therefore, is the time for the clergy to rally around the Society, and supply the Committee with a valuable and unexceptionable catalogue, with books containing sound doctrine, and written in an interesting form. If those clergymen who feel the necessity of a change, hold back, and do not assist the committee in their attempts to accomplish one, we must expect nothing but a continuance of the existing evils; and the result must be, that the National Schools will lose their hold on the affections of the people. Let me then intreat your reverend readers to come forward to the help of our church, and, rather than desert the citadel in this hour of danger, seek to repair one of the most important of her bulwarks.

E. H.

ON THE USE OF PORTABLE CHALICES AND PATENS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE frequently observed advertised in the newspapers, in the lists of the Birmingham and Sheffield manufacturers, portable Chalices and Patens for the use of clergymen; and the same articles are to be seen in the windows of several of the silversmiths in London. I would not lay much stress upon matters not of serious moment; but as some clerical friends in my neighbourhood have discussed the question whether it is proper, especially in the present circumstances of the church, for clergymen to carry about a pocket communion apparatus for the administration of the Lord's Supper to the sick in private houses, I would briefly mention the grounds upon which I think it better not. The practice tends to no good object; and may engender ideas of superstition. The popish priest keeps the host ready stored up for use, having been first consecrated upon a sacrificial altar; but the Protestant clergy have been accustomed to use such decent apparatus as they found in the sick man's dwelling: and our rubric, to prevent superstition, directs that the remainder of the ele-

ments used at church shall be eaten, and not preserved. It is often difficult to get the communicant to divest his mind of there being a sort of mysterious charm in the hallowed rite; and to arrive at a spiritual and Protestant understanding of the nature and object of the Holy Communion; and this difficulty may be increased by special vessels being brought to his house for the occasion. The portion of the rubric for the communion of the Sick, which mentions the preparation, is not very clearly expressed; but the words, "having a convenient place in the sick man's house, with all things necessary so prepared that the curate may reverently minister," seem to imply that the sick man, and those who are to communicate with him, are to have the preparations in readiness for the curate, and not that the curate is to bring the implements of preparation with him.

It is only of late years that a portable apparatus would have been tolerated; for when the popular alarms respecting Popery were more vivid than at present, it would have caused great scandal: and even now there are many persons who would not communicate if a clergyman came to their house thus equipped, lest they should seem to countenance popish superstition. It is befitting that in a church there should be vessels for the administration of the Lord's Supper; and it would imply gross irreverence to devote them to any other use; but there is no peculiar sacredness in them, as the Romanists fondly dream: the benefits to be received are spiritual: they depend upon the faith of the partaker, according to the ordinance of God, and not either upon the worthiness of the administrator, or upon consecrated vessels; and the poorest man who can furnish only a few spoonfuls of wine in a cup, may justly feel that he has complied with the rubric, and requires from his minister only spiritual services, not a costly gold or silver apparatus. Why should not a clergyman carry in his pocket a portable font as much as a sacramental cup? If he wishes to spare a poor man the expense or trouble of procuring a little wine, let him give him some in the least ostentatious manner, and use it in any fitting vessel which is offered to him for the purpose. The sacraments are not the less valued for being regarded with the simplicity of scriptural and Protestant principles, without any attempt to create reverence by adventitious adjuncts. The pious sick man can shew forth his Lord's death with the homely vessels which his cottage affords; and if he tendered what was necessary, a clergyman would not be justified, either legally or morally, in excommunicating him because he objected to the portable apparatus.

Put the case as follows. Suppose a sick parishioner should say that he had a Protestant scruple of conscience as to the portable Chalice and Paten being used at his bed-side. Would the clergyman explain to him that his scruple was superstitious; for that the apparatus is of no consequence, provided it be decent—whether a gourd in Africa, or a golden cup in a cathedral? The sick man might reply, Why then not use the simple apparatus which I have furnished? why employ vessels which, from association, convey to my mind superstitious notions of pretended sanctity? Or would the clergyman take the opposite view, reasoning after the exaggerating manner of Archbishop Laud, upon the duty of hallowing the utensils of Divine worship? This would only make the matter worse; and in any case, he could not properly persist in using his portable apparatus, if he found either that it gave offence to one person, or encouraged superstitious

notions in another. Why, then, run either of these risks? It may delight some poor ignorant formalists to be able to say that the clergyman gave them the sacrament at their homes from beautiful silver vessels, to which they attach some mysterious virtue: but the pious, well-instructed parishioner, who "discerns the Lord's body," will find no edification in such extraneous ceremonials.

ANGLICANUS.

NEW ARGUMENT FOR THE VOLUNTARY AID AGAINST THE PAROCHIAL PRINCIPLE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THOUGH you advocate National Church Establishments, as opposed to the Voluntary, or what you call the casual principle, your sense of justice will I trust induce you to admit the following facts, which clearly prove that the principle for which you contend is opposed to peace, and the free exercise of liberty of conscience.

I live in a hamlet situated about two miles from the parish church. Till within the last three years our neighbourhood was tranquil—I mean, not disturbed by theological contentions. I do not pretend that we were better than our neighbours, but I dare say we were quite as good; if we did not go very regularly to church, we employed or amused ourselves in a harmless manner at home; the better sort had dinner parties; the labourers went to the beer-houses, where they enjoyed comfortable conversation, and enlarged their minds by reading Sunday newspapers; while their wives got up the arrears of the week, and the young men and women strolled peacefully in the lanes, and the children gathered blackberries in the fields. I admit that we had a good deal of poaching, and wood-stealing, and poultry-stealing; and that there was much swearing, and quarrelling, and fighting in the village, both on working days and Sundays; and that the farmers were rapacious and cheating, and the labourers idle and disorderly; and that the poor-house was over crowded; and that the cottages were in a sad state of dilapidation; and that many of the women were slatterns, and their children vagabonds; and that we had more parish weddings than voluntary ones; and that there was a good deal of poverty, and filth, and starvation about us; but taking all things into consideration, I repeat, that we were not worse, I suppose, than our neighbours; and what always pleased me, who am a man of easy temper, we had no religious broils, which I consider a great benefit.

And now, Sir, to what I had to say respecting the parochial system which you write so much about, and the voluntary or casual system. The latter was tried, but happily did not succeed. A Baptist minister came among us, but he could make no way, for the people said they had no occasion for his services. An Independent followed, backed by the purse of a wealthy tradesman, who offered the loan of a hundred pounds, upon five per cent. mortage, towards the building of a meeting-house; but the minister said that the people were so stupid and ignorant that they would not pay for sittings, or contribute to keep up the interest; and that it answered much better to go to a place where there was a church, and a faithful zealous clergy-

man, and a school, for that there the people knew enough of religion to favour an impression being made upon them; and instead of labouring, at great expense and toil, in rescuing from the waste a piece of hard ground, overgrown with thorns, and fencing it in, and sowing seed, and manuring, and weeding, a crop of seedlings would be found ready to hand, from which plants might be stolen with much less labour than new ones could be raised; and a meeting-house be built and supported, not by calling out new resources, but by transferring old ones. The Baptist preacher candidly owned that he had not so much success in reclaiming sinners as in baptising saints; which the Independent minister, upon whose fold he encroached as much as the Independent encroached upon others, called in set phrase "living by sheep-stealing." He did not rear, but sheared from other men's flocks; so that there was not more wool produced, only he obtained some of it.

But such things passed over our hamlet very quietly; and happily voluntaryism, after a few efforts, gave us up in despair. But not so your provoking, meddling, aggressive, parochial system, as you call it. I foreboded the result the moment the vicar proposed locating a church among us, and the evil is now past remedy. The church brought with it not only its proper Sunday services, but daily and Sunday schools, and Bible and Prayer-book clubs, and Visiting societies, and cottage lectures, and I know not what; so that the whole character of the place is changed, and its peace destroyed. One man has qualms about his decent Sunday quart of ale at the beer-shop; the children are prating catechisms; the paupers are troubling their brains about the ten commandments; the butcher and baker have been persuaded to shut up their shop on Sunday, which has forced some of the farmers, to their great inconvenience, to pay their labourers early on Saturday evening; religious liberty is wholly destroyed, for one after another taking to the new ways, those who keep in the old ones find themselves marked men, and their rights of conscience are infringed by a sort of secret persecution, better felt than described. Take my own case. I like to rise a little later than usual on Sunday mornings, to recruit after the week; and to take a healthy drive; and to have a dinner party—all very innocent and proper things; but my servants see other servants go to church, and seem to think it hard they cannot do so too; and thus my religious liberty is exposed to moral torture. I can hardly read my John Bull Sunday-newspaper in my summer house, without being accounted a sort of heathen by the children as they pass by to the Sunday school; and when I go to dine with a friend, I hear the church bell ringing, and meet people with their prayer-books, which makes one almost feel as if one were doing wrong. Then again, theological tracts are flying all about the parish; most of which are libels in disguise, as they reprobate what every body is saying and doing. Two or three farmers have told the postman not to deliver their weekly newspapers on Sunday morning; and the man says, that if I would do the same (my house being three miles from the post-office) he could go to church; so that I feel as if I were the cause of his inconvenience only by using my religious liberty. And then, go where one will, there is a general stir about religious doctrines; by which I mean that Christianity, instead of being kept in its proper place, is brought from the church to the parlour and drawing room; conversation is spoiled; and some of my own friends are

beginning to turn over a new leaf, as if they had been all their lives wicked people, though they have lived just like every body else, not one bit worse—and better was not required, except for clergymen and such like. In short, we are all in a hubbub; this is not right, and that is not right, and the other is not right; and I suppose the ferment will not settle till we all become as great Methodists as the parson; and have prayers in our houses night and morning; and go twice to church; and give a mint of money for schools, and bibles, and missions; and live, in short, as if we were in heaven before we get there.

I do not mean to say that the new church is an unmixed evil. The nuisances which I mentioned above, are a good deal abated; there is more thrift and cleanliness; we have fewer rogues; things look more decent; pauperism has diminished; the women behave better; and I think the new Savings Bank and Friendly Society will answer very well. Nor do I object to a good moral sermon; as it can do no harm, if it does not make people sour and puritanical; and it is pretty enough to see the children in their clean clothes going to school and church; and the farmers say their labourers behave better; and the boys and girls out of the school get good situations; so that I suppose they are not so much hurt by their learning and praying as might have been expected. You see that I am not a fastidious objector, a wholesale finder of fault. Our clergyman is very kind and gentlemanly, and I am sure means well; but my complaint is, that this parochial system, as it is called, is spoiling both town and country for living in. I cared nothing for the voluntaries; one never came in contact with them: I knew little about them; they gave me no offence; but once follow up parochial ministrations in the new-fashioned way,—which they say is only an old fashion revived—and adieu to all peace, and quietness, and liberty of conscience. You cannot get out of the snare; go where you will, you are tacitly reproached, if you are not a church-keeper, by the example of every person who is; in short, Sir, I am fully of opinion, that if an Established Church is not passive, it is far better not to have one; for it cannot stir without stirring every body else; and its intercourse with all classes of society brings it home to your door in such a manner, that you must go out of your way to escape it; which, to a man like me, who does not wish to be troubled about curious matter, is excessively provoking; and I can only say, that if the bulk of my neighbours become as religious as some of them seem inclined to do, quiet men like myself will be obliged to seek some land of liberty where they cannot be morally tortured by the sound of bells and the sight of steeples.

SQUIRARCHIUS.

ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AFTER CONFIRMATION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE Bishop of London directs, in his admonitions for confirmation, that no person shall be presented to him for that rite (except under special circumstances) under sixteen years of age; and I believe that some other bishops adopt the same regulation. As a general rule,

that age is wisely fixed upon, as few boys or girls at a younger period are sufficiently instructed and religiously impressed to appreciate the solemn nature of the service; while at the same time it is not well, for many obvious reasons, to delay it longer than that time, if the candidate is duly prepared. It is, however, only as a general rule that any particular age can be specified; for there are some children, much younger, who both by their religious knowledge and their devotion of heart and life to the service of God, are well qualified to approach the table of the Lord with faith and spiritual intelligence "discerning the Lord's body;" while too many persons at a more advanced age have not the same pre-requisites.

But at whatever age the catechumen is confirmed, it is in every respect befitting that he should forthwith partake of the Lord's supper. His examination and approval for confirmation, are in fact what the Protestant churches on the continent call the preparation for the first communion; and if he is not found both in knowledge and principle fit to be a communicant, he is not fit for confirmation. The dissenters (I speak chiefly of Independents and Baptists), and also generally the Presbyterians and the Methodists, usually defer the reception of the Lord's supper to a later period; they have few if any communicants so young as sixteen, and not many under twenty.

All things then considered, and especially the importance of there not being a long parenthesis, as often happens, perhaps of several years, between confirmation and the reception of the Lord's supper, the age prescribed by the Bishop of London, is, generally speaking, sufficiently early; but I am anxious to impress upon my clerical brethren, that when the rite of comfirmation is administered there ought to be no delay in coming to the Lord's table. Archbishop Whateley has adopted the plan of having the holy communion administered on the day of the confirmation; but there are considerable inconveniences attending this practice. The young persons often come from considerable distances; they are perhaps much excited or fatigued; the office, though short in itself, is protracted in consequence of the number of the catechumens; besides which there is an address from the bishop, the whole being usually preceded by a portion of the church service; so that under all circumstances it seems better to defer the reception of the Lord's supper till the next Lord's day, or other first opportunity; in order to avoid distraction, and to give the candidate leisure for serious reflection, both upon the solemn obligation which he has undertaken, and the duty and blessedness of renewing it in the appropriating ordinance of the Lord's supper. The Archbishop of Dublin's plan is not directed by the rubric; and I think it hurries these solemn transactions too much, and prevents the benefits which arise from giving time for thought and prayer, between the ratification of the baptismal vow and the reception of the holy eucharist.

I would, however, respectfully suggest the propriety of following up the spirit of the Archbishop of Dublin's plan, by not allowing any lengthened period to elapse between the day of confirmation and the administration of the Lord's supper to those of the candidates who wish to partake of it. In churches where there is a monthly communion, it is not perhaps necessary in all cases to interpose a special administration; though if there are many young persons in the

parish who have been confirmed, that might be done for the occasion on the Sunday succeeding the rite, and with striking and useful effect. But where, as is unhappily the case in many country parishes, the ordinary administration is only on a few of the festivals, there ought assuredly to be an interjected opportunity afforded; for three months or more are too long to keep the confirmed persons from that divinely-ordained means of grace: nor indeed ought any parish, however small, to be kept thus on short allowance, or famine fare, when there is a minister of Christ appointed to be ready at all times to supply the spiritual wants of his flock.

PASTOR.

DEAN SWIFT'S WILL.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

AMONG the documents in the Prerogative Office in Dublin, is preserved the last will and testament of Dean Swift (dated May 3, 1740), written upon vellum with his own hand. The following sarcastic extract from it is curious, as shewing the opinion of this remarkable man a century since as to the tendency which ecclesiastical affairs were even then taking in Ireland. The Dean did not discern that such a man as himself brought more disgrace upon his order than the bright example of a thousand pious, zealous, exemplary clergymen could efface; but he was shrewd in estimating the course of events, and I do not think he was mistaken in conjecturing that should the Protestant episcopal national church in Ireland be subverted, the time may not be distant when "Christianity under any shape" will not be tolerated. The annals of the French revolution threw a blaze of lurid light on this subject.

"Item, Whereas I purchased the inheritance of the tithes of the parish of Effernock, near Trim, in the county of Meath, for £260 sterling: I bequeath the said tithes to the Vicars of Laracor, for the time being, that is to say, *so long as the present Episcopal religion shall continue to be the national established faith and profession in this kingdom: but whenever any other form of Christian religion shall become the established faith in this kingdom,* I leave the said tithes of Effernock to be bestowed, as the profits come in, to the poor of the said parish of Laracor, by a weekly proportion, and by such other officers as may then have the power of distributing charities to the poor of the said parish, *while Christianity under any shape shall be tolerated among us, still excepting professed Jews, Atheists, and Infidels.*"

J. J.

RECENT VOYAGE TO LOO-CHOO AND JAPAN.

For the Christian Observer.

CAPTAIN Basil Hall's interesting account of the Loo-choo Islands, in his popular narrative of the voyage of Lord Amherst's embassy to China in 1816, excited much curiosity to know more of "the gentle islanders," who form a striking contrast to their fierce and treacherous Japanese neighbours. The Jesuit missionaries laboured from the year 1549 to 1638 in Japan; but their converts were ex-

terminated by persecution two hundred years ago, since which period Japan, like the vast empire of China, has opposed the most formidable—we do not say insuperable—barriers to the introduction of Christian missions. Even the meek and timid Loo-choos, whose peaceful habits excited the ridicule and incredulity of Buonaparte, who could not credit Capt. Hall's statement that they never go to war, and possess no kind of offensive or defensive weapons,* are as hostile to European intercourse as their rougher neighbours; and no favourable opportunity has yet occurred of introducing a missionary among them.

In the summer of last year a voyage was planned by Mr. King, of the well-known American house of Oliphant and Co.,† for the purpose of returning to their country seven shipwrecked Japanese residing at Macao, and at the same time of endeavouring to open a communication with that secluded empire. Three of these men were wrecked on the western shores of America in 1832, from whence they were sent to London, and thence to Macao, where they arrived in 1835; the other four were driven ashore at Luconia, and, after a variety of adventures, also found their way to Macao. The following particulars of the voyage, we think, will interest our readers, in connexion with the various efforts now making to facilitate intercourse, with a view to introduce Christianity into China and the neighbouring countries and islands:

"The party in the Morrison, consisting of Mr. King and his lady, Dr. Parker, who was provided with a large stock of medicines, and S. Wells Williams, set sail on the 4th of July (from Macao), and on the 12th anchored at Napa-keang, a port on the S. W. side of Lewchew, the same that was visited by Captains Hall and Beechey. We remained in the harbour three days, during which time we had much pleasant intercourse with the inhabitants, going on shore daily, and receiving visits from the officers on board ship. The people were kind and inoffensive, accompanying us in crowds wherever we went, without ever offering

* See Capt. Hall's account of his interview with Buonaparte in St. Helena. "What," said Buonaparte, "not even spears, or bows and arrows! *How then do they fight?*"

† These Christian merchants chartered a schooner for the purpose of an experimental cruise. The last Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society gives some particulars of the distribution of Bibles by Mr. Lay and the missionaries during the voyage. It is added:

"Mr. King, of the firm of Messrs. Oliphant, King, and Co., of America, for the use of whose vessel this Society, and the cause of Christian missions, is so deeply indebted, has, in a letter to a friend, of which the following is an extract, brought the present state of the Philippine Isles under the notice of your Committee. 'We are now,' writes Mr. K., 'equally surprised and pleased to find, that, under the present government of the Philippine Islands, a very happy change has already taken place in their colonial regulations. Formerly the Roman-catholic influence was paramount there, and books were subjected, on importation, to a rigid inspection, which excluded every thing Protestant. Now we learn that the Bibles which have been sent over from this, have been admitted freely, and have been taken up with great avidity. This fact may have already been communicated to you; I would, in this case, confirm what I am too late to impart, and commend this providence to your attention. If the present government be still maintained, you cannot be wrong in sending 1,000 Spanish Bibles to Lintin, to be forwarded thence, under whatever precautions may be expedient, to Manilla. Should your agent be absent, our Missionaries will supply his place, and any secular assistance they may need we can readily afford them. There are, we believe, some translations extant in the native dialects of these islands; we shall request our friends at Manilla to look after them. Perhaps they may deserve publication in England or America."

On a perusal of the above, the Committee voted 1,000 Spanish Bibles for the use of the Philippine Islands.

the slightest rudeness; the magistrates, however, always wished us to return to the boat, devising all the ways their politeness would permit, to abridge our walks. The conversation with the chiefs was conducted in Chinese, which when written was intelligible to both parties. Many of the higher classes could speak good Chinese, and this enabled us at times to exchange our thoughts more rapidly. The language of the common people in Lewchew is Japanese, with perhaps a dialectical variation. There were at this time seven Japanese junks in port belonging to the principality of Satzuma.

"The Lewchew group is supposed to contain about 20,000 inhabitants, and to comprise upwards of fifty islands; but the data for both these statements are very unsatisfactory. The largest is 60 miles long by 15 broad; and many of the others support a sparse population. They are under the control of the Japanese, who monopolize many of the offices, and exercise a vigilant supervision over the whole. The people formerly sent tribute to China at regular seasons, and were much under the direction of the court at Peking; but from what we could learn, this influence is growing weaker, while that of Yédo is yearly strengthening. There were no Chinese junks in port, nor were there any people of that nation seen; although Lewchewan junks visit China for trade. When we were leaving, payment for the provisions furnished to the ship was offered to the chiefs; but they could not be prevailed upon to accept the least remuneration, saying, that it was against their laws to buy or sell with foreigners; that they merely gave us a few articles, for which they would take no pay. The probability that a missionary or a physician would be allowed to settle among them is very slight.

"After having taken Mr. Gutzlaff on board from H. B. M. sloop Raleigh, Captain Quin, we set sail for Yédo, the capital of the Japanese empire. We came in sight of the bay, at the top of which Yédo is situated, on the 27th of July, and were obliged to beat up against a north-easterly wind for 60 miles. The number of fishing smacks and junks in sight was very great; and by some of them intimation of our approach was probably given to the officers on the shores of the bay; and also carried to the capital. During the night of the 29th we proceeded up the bay of Yédo nearly 40 miles, with much difficulty making the course, on account of the darkness and fog; and our doubts were also increased by the charts of this unfrequented spot being too small to be of much service. The morning was so misty that we could hardly discern the banks; but we could hear the firing of cannon far ahead of us, although the ship could not be seen by those on shore. About noon, it broke away clear, and we saw the shot falling three fourths of a mile ahead of us, being fired from a fort situated on a hill near the anchorage of Ouragawa, which we wished to reach. Another fort was placed on the opposite hill, from which guns were also fired; these two forts defend the passage into the anchorage, as those at Bocca Tigris guard the passage to Whampoa. On seeing the shot, we came to anchor about 4 miles below the fort, at a distance of a mile and a quarter from the shore.

"As soon as we had anchored, several fishing boats crowded with natives came off to the ship, curious to see so unusual a sight. Mr. Gutzlaff conversed with them freely, requesting them when they returned on shore to tell the magistrates that we wished to see them. Nothing was brought off to sell, every one coming from mere curiosity; yet they were friendly and talkative, inviting us to come on shore and ramble about. This we promised to do as soon as the rain would permit us; and a trip was planned for next morning. The country lying before us was very inviting, and the alternation of hill and dale, of wooded height and tilled plain, of dark rocky ledge and bright green field, was picturesque. The natives were slightly clad, although the weather was cold; and are a much stouter race of men than the Chinese of the southern provinces, though probably not as tall.

"During the night we observed no intimations of hostility; but as soon as the morning broke, we were surprised by shot falling over and about us, which were fired from four guns that had been brought down from the fort near Ouragawa, and placed on the bank directly opposite the ship, and in such an exposed situation as only those would take, who knew that no defence would be made. The ship's armament had all been left at Lintin; as we wished to try the success of a perfectly peaceful attempt, and to ascertain how far those who went unarmed and in good faith, would meet with a friendly reception. For it has often been said, that the attacks made on foreigners by the natives of countries little visited, were owing chiefly to their standing on the defensive against those who appeared so strange and so hostile. As soon as the firing began, we commenced weighing anchor and removing out of the reach of the guns, which was not until they had

discharged one or two hundred shot at the vessel. Through the good hand of God only one ball hit the hull, doing no damage. They continued firing long after we were beyond their reach, and while we lay to for the purpose of allowing the officers to come on board, if any intended so to do. But none came, and we left the bay; judging that, after such a commitment of hostile intention, no officers would come to treat or to ascertain our errand, even if we should anchor nearer the coast. We gave a piece of painted canvas to a boat astern, on which was merely written our desire to negociate; but no reply was returned; and thus our object, nation, and character were unknown to those on shore!

"Still desirous of executing the design of the voyage, we bore away for some one of the southern ports, and on the 10th of August arrived in the bay at Satzuma, where the Portuguese and Xavier once landed. As soon as we reached the entrance of the bay, two of our Japanese were put on shore in order to find an officer at the nearest village and bring him on board. After an hour's absence they returned with a petty officer, who wore two swords in his girdle, and who declared that the inhabitants of his village were so terrified at our approach that they would have fired upon us, if the men we had sent had not come to explain. After hearing our story, and receiving some refreshment, he left us in company with two other of the seven men, in order to give their deposition before a higher magistrate on the opposite side of the bay, taking with him our papers addressed to the prince of Satzuma, to send to the capital Kagosima. After an absence of three or four hours, the two men returned, highly delighted with their reception, and at the 'sweet word' they had heard from the officer at Miabara. Their deposition (they told us,) was very minute, and delivered in the presence of several hundred of natives, all of whom joined in praising the 'benevolent foreigners.'

"After it had been taken down in writing, it was sealed and despatched to the capital; and they were sent back to the ship, along with a pilot, and directed to tell us to come to anchor, where we must wait for an answer. Every one (as near as they could learn), who heard the story of the men, was of the opinion that our message would be received, and that a high officer from court would be commissioned to take our papers, and receive the men. It was our design, in sending our papers by the first officer, to have them at the capital when a decision upon our case was passed; but the magistrate at Miabara said he could not receive them; they must be retained until a higher officer came down.

"We accordingly came to anchor, though the birth was not a very desirable one; and waited, from the evening of Thursday until Saturday morning, for boats to tow us into a safer harbour, (as they had promised,) and for the arrival of the great officer. Several guard-boats were stationed by the Japanese, to prevent all communication between us and the people; and nothing was brought off, except a cask of water, although we had repeatedly requested some refreshments. After we came into the bay, early in the morning several fishing and other boats came off to see the ship; but when at anchor our guard prevented the common people having any intercourse; the Japanese on board were also strictly confined to the ship. The country before us was even more beautiful and picturesque than in the bay of Yédo; and we thought the inhabitants, judging from their churlishness and bad government, were unfit to possess so fair a portion of the world. Terraces were seen ascending the sides of hills; and trees were abundant on their summits.

"About seven o'clock on Saturday morning, we observed the people on shore much excited, running here and there, and mustering in little groups on the eminences near the beach. Soon after we saw several strips of cloth, blue and white in bars, stretched from tree to tree, among the stones of a grave-yard. Behind the cloth were many persons assembled; having flags and guns, and officers on horseback were seen hastening to and fro, all betokening some hostile operations. As soon as our Japanese saw the canvas bearing the arms of the prince of Satzuma, they said that a messenger had probably come from the capital, and that his orders were to drive us away. Our suspicions of an intended attack were strong, and we accordingly began to heave in the cable, and hoist the yards to the tops, in such a manner as not to excite the notice of those on shore; and showed the American colours. Before we made any sail, the party behind the canvas battery began to fire at us with musquetry, the shot falling about half way to the ship. Although there was no wind, and a strong flood tide setting in, we concluded it best to weigh anchor, and get beyond their reach, before any cannon should be brought to bear on us. In doing so, we narrowly escaped getting foul of a rock towards which the tide was drifting us: and were carried five or six miles farther up the bay than we had before ventured. As we came out, which was very slowly,

and against a head wind, cannon were fired at us from the opposite side; but in this spacious and deep bay we had plenty of sea-room, in tacking, to avoid the shot from both sides. The firing was continued, even from the musquetry, until dark, and after we had passed out of the bay.

"No attempt was made to come on board by any of our guard, though we repeatedly told the officers, that if they did not wish to receive the men on shore, we would depart at the first intimation of their pleasure, and that there was no call for any force to drive us away. Perhaps, however, the execution of our repulsion was committed to other and higher hands than those who were appointed to watch us!

"After leaving the bay, we concluded there was little prospect of being received at any other port, and our men declared that their lives would be in jeopardy, if they should be received at any other port, or if they should attempt to steal ashore under cover of night. The risk of detection in the latter case was greatly increased by the minuteness of the deposition given at Miabara, which they said government would send both to Yedo and to their homes. Their disappointment was great, for their expectations had been raised to the highest pitch; and three of them now shaved their heads like Buddhist priests, in order that the hair might grow equably, thereby showing their determination to live among foreigners. All agreed that there was no other way but quietly going back, and becoming perpetual exiles!

"After a pleasant passage down the coast of China, we reached Macao on the 29th of August, in the enjoyment of excellent health, and thankful that we had been preserved from all dangers."

We rejoice to hear that the New Testament is being translated into Japanese, under the care of the Rev. Charles Gutzlaff of China. He has in his family two natives of Japan, one of whom is wholly devoted to the prosecution of this work under his superintendance. Such an opportunity may not occur again for many years.

STATISTICS OF VOLUNTARYISM.

For the Christian Observer.

A WRITER in a former page of our present Number might have better effected his purpose of shewing the defectiveness of what is called the Voluntary Principle, by a statistical than by an ironical argument. If the voluntary principle be as potent as is alleged, why has it not done its duty? Why are any of our towns or villages still scantily supplied with religious instruction? Who or what has prevented meeting-houses keeping pace with the population, wherever there was a deficiency of churches? The parochial system has, at least, done so much, that less is required to be done by casual agency; yet, even with this help, the latter has proved insufficient: how much more, therefore, would it have been so, if it had been left to do the whole? A man who cannot pay twenty pounds, aided by a loan of fifteen, surely cannot pay it unaided.

We will illustrate our statement by some extracts from a little publication by a respectable Dissenting minister, which happens to be in our hands at the moment. It is entitled: "The Neglect of Souls: a Sermon preached in behalf of the Norwich City Mission, August 15, 1837; and in behalf of the Pimlico Association, Buckingham Chapel, in aid of the London City Mission, November 19, 1837. With an Appendix of the Ecclesiastical Statistics of the City and Liberty of Westminster. By Robert Ainslie."

This pious and zealous writer puts forth the following appalling statements:

"What is the state of Norwich? Is this venerable city thoroughly evangelized? Is the mass of your city population leavened with the Gospel? Let the

following facts answer. It appears that the population is about 62,000, and that there are thirty-six Episcopal churches and thirty chapels belonging to various denominations unconnected with the Establishment, providing accommodation (I have understood) for about 20,000. Many of these places are not well attended, and therefore the Sabbath is not observed by some thousands of the inhabitants. In the sixteen districts canvassed by the Norwich Auxiliary Tract Society, the following facts have transpired as to the profanation of the Sabbath:—'417 public-houses and liquor-shops; 415 hucksters, grocers, cake and fruit shops; 117 bakers; 40 butchers; 40 barbers; 7 eating-houses, and 46 of other descriptions, were found open for the transaction of ordinary business on the divinely appointed day of rest and worship. It appears also that most of the pleasure-boats which are to be let on the river are engaged all the Sabbath; and it is estimated that not less than 20,000 persons continually devote the Lord's-day to business and pleasure, idleness and crime. Several packet-boats go down the river every Sabbath-day (during the season), and are crowded with passengers at a very low fare; whilst the news-rooms, steam-packets, and the increased number of public gardens, collect in various parties gentlemen and mechanics, domestic servants and apprentices, to indulge in habits of undignified and demoralizing idleness and worldly pleasure.'

"The state of education in some parts of the city is most defective. One of the agents of your Mission says, 'My district contains about 1,275 persons. Out of this number there are but twenty-seven persons *who make a profession* of religion. After deducting the aged and infirm, and every child under five years of age, there are 606 who live in the habitual neglect of the Sabbath; they ramble in great numbers to the neighbouring hills, where they spend their time in gambling, or any other pursuits which the joint conference of depraved hearts may suggest; nearly all, if not quite all, the shops and public-houses are open on the Lord's-day.' In the same district there are 220 adults, and 223 persons between the ages of five and twenty-one, making a total of 443 persons in that district who cannot read.

"Another district contains 1,506 persons, 880 are upwards of twelve years of age, 600 of whom entirely neglect the public worship of God. There are 148 adults, and 222 children above five years of age, making a total of 370 in that district who cannot read. Of another district, the Agent reports, 'A large number, both of men and women of more than thirty years of age, cannot read, and therefore no distribution of tracts or books can meet their case without the assistance of living instructors.'"

Now why, we repeat, has not voluntaryism done its duty, and prevented all this mass of evil? Hear Mr. Ainslie's own admission of its past neglect, and his zealous exhortation for the supply of its deficiencies:

"Very much may be effected by voluntary visitation, but it has not, and it will not, apparently, overtake the wants of the population. Men must be assigned to the work, just as a pastor is placed over a church; and it must be imperative on them to see that the people are warned from their wickedness, and invited to come to the Lord Jesus Christ, for a free and full salvation by his precious blood and perfect righteousness. And cannot men be obtained? They can. But we must not expect them raised up by miracle. The Church has only just begun to ask for them. It would be a libel upon the Churches of Britain, if they could not furnish holy and self-denying men for every city and town of the kingdom, to visit from house to house, and to tell their inhabitants the way of salvation by Christ Jesus. And if the men can be found, shall they be unemployed because the Christians of Britain will not support them? *Is it a fact*, that an agency sufficient to take the Gospel to every humble dwelling—to every neglected family—to every profligate and infidel household in Norwich, can be employed for about 2,000*l.* per annum? And will not the Christians of Norwich contribute it? What a satisfaction would it be to you as Christians, at a monthly meeting for prayer for the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants of this city, if it could be stated by your pastors, by the reports of your agents, and by accurate statistical information, that every family since your last meeting had heard the words of eternal life! How consistently, then, could you plead with God for his blessing! Until the work is entered upon in some such spirit, we cannot expect great results, nor those signal triumphs of the power of the Gospel witnessed in Apostolic times.'

"But is it said that the money cannot be raised? Why not? Is there none? Is there no property in Norwich? None among your bankers, merchants, pro-

fessional men, and tradesmen? Do you reply—Yes, we have money, but not for this purpose. What? Not to spread the Gospel in your city? Not to take the tidings of peace from house to house, and room to room, and thus bless your neglected population! Must it all be spent upon your houses, your furniture, your elections, your persons, and upon any thing but the spiritual welfare of your city? No, no. The fame of many of your Christian citizens tells us that you are prepared to employ what you possess, under the impression that you will have to give an account of it; and no account will be more honourable and acceptable than that you devoted it, for the honour of Christ in the redemption of immortal souls.'"

If the comparatively small sum of £2000 per annum will supply all these wants, it would not be a very wonderful exertion, if, in a wealthy city like Norwich, it were raised for a time, were it only from a determination to shew the potency of the voluntary principle. But even should relief be afforded at the moment, there is no guarantee for its permanence; and were Norwich supplied, this would be but a drop in the mighty waters compared with the general destitution of the people; and would not prove that the same effect would follow in scattered rural districts, or in new towns or villages, which have grown up without adequate enlargement of church-room, and where the great majority of the people are both poor and irreligious. Norwich, according to Mr. Ainslie's own statement, has thirty-six churches and thirty Dissenting chapels, for 62,000 persons—which is more than one for every thousand; that is, after making due deductions for little children, the sick, the aged, and persons of various classes lawfully remaining at home in rotation, one church for about every 300 or 400 available worshippers: so that the destitution is not by any means so great as fairly to test the strength of the voluntary principle; yet even here it is admitted to have failed; nor is there any reason to suppose that it will succeed in future.

But let us take a wider and larger defalcation in the case of the metropolitan city of Westminster. The following are Mr. Ainslie's statistics:—

"THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS OF WESTMINSTER.
(As to Church and Chapel Accommodation.)

Westminster Abbey (Chapel), 600.

There are eight parishes in Westminster, reckoning, as is usually done, the united parishes of St. Margaret's and St. John's as one parish.

1. *The Parish of St. George, Hanover-square.*—In this parish, whose population is 52,209, the Established Church has provided accommodation for 12,700 persons; viz. St. Peter's, Pimlico, 1800; Belgrave Chapel, 1000; St. George's, 1500; Grosvenor Chapel, 950; Curzon Chapel, 1200; Hanover Chapel, 1500; St. Mark's, 1450; John-street Chapel, 1000; Eton Chapel, 800; The Lock Chapel, 1000; Knightsbridge Chapel, 500.

Other denominations have provided accommodation for 1500 persons, viz.—New Ranelagh Chapel (Wesleyan), 100; Gillingham-street (Independent), 100; Wistbourne-street (Baptist), 300; Robert-street (Independent), 500; Shepherd's Market, 500; leaving a population unprovided for of 38,009 persons.

2. *St. James, Piccadilly.*—Population, 37,000. Accommodation provided by the Established Church, 4,750: viz. St. James's, 1700; St. Philip's, 1500; Archbishop Tennison's Chapel, 950; York Street Chapel, 600.

Other denominations have provided accommodation for 4100 persons; viz. Craven Chapel, 2300; French Protestant Chapel, 200; Swallow-street Scotch Church, 600; Peter-street (Wesleyan) 400; Synagogue, St. Alban's-Place, 600; leaving a population unprovided for of 28,150 persons.

3. *St. Ann, Soho.*—Population, 15,600 persons. Accommodation provided by the Established Church, 1450 persons, viz. St. Ann's, 1450. Other denominations have provided accommodation for 4200 persons; viz. Grafton-street, 300; Crown-street (Independent), 900; Sutton-street (Roman Catholic), 1000; Salem Chapel (Baptist), 600; Soho Chapel (Baptist), 500; Little Chapel-street (Independent), 900; leaving a population unprovided for of 9,950 persons.

4. *St. Martin.*—Population, 23,970 persons. Accommodation provided by the Established Church, 3960 persons; viz. St. Martin's, 2000; St. Matthew's, 360; Long-acre, 800; Trinity Chapel, 800. Other denominations have provided accommodation for 3300 persons; viz. Adelphi Chapel (Independent), 500; Orange-street Chapel, 1000; Oxendon-street (Presbyterian), 500; Peter's-place (Society of Friends) 300; leaving a population unprovided for of 17,710 persons.

5. *St. Paul, Covent Garden.*—Population, 5,203 persons. The Established Church has provided accommodation for 2,300 persons; viz. St. Paul's, 1200; Tavistock Chapel, 800; Savoy Chapel, 300. Other denominations have provided accommodation for 1,800 persons; viz. German Lutheran Church, 800; Jews' Synagogue, 100; Scotch Church, Crown-court, 800; Duchy-place (Baptist), 100; leaving a population unprovided for of 1,103 persons.

6. *St. Clement Danes.*—Population, 15,442 persons. The Established Church has provided accommodation for 1,350 persons; viz. St. Clement's Church, 1350. Other denominations have provided accommodation for 1,500 persons; viz. New Court Chapel (Independent), 700; Essex-street Chapel (Unitarian), 550; Clement's lane (Baptist), 250; leaving a population unprovided for of 12,592 persons.

7. *St. Mary-le-Strand.*—Population, 2,273 persons. The Established Church has provided accommodation for 500 persons; viz. St. Mary-le-Strand, 250; King's College Chapel, 250; leaving a population unprovided for of 1,773 persons.

8. *St. Margaret and St. John.*—Population, 51,982 persons. The Established Church has provided accommodation for 6,266 persons; viz. St. Margaret's, 1500; St. John's, 2008; Broadway Chapel, 908; Charlotte-street Chapel, 800; Queen-square, 350; Vincent-square, 700. Other denominations have provided accommodation for 3,770 persons; viz. Romney-street (Baptist), 500; Buckingham Chapel, (Independent), 800; Duke-street Chapel, 400; Trevor-square Chapel, 800; Lewisham-street Chapel, 220; White-Horse-yard (Wesleyan), 100; Blue Anchor-yard, 150; Horseferry-road (Wesleyan), 500; Horseferry-road (Roman Catholic), 300; leaving a population unprovided for of 41,946 persons.

The total amount of the population of the City and Liberty of Westminster is 203,679 persons.

The Established Church has provided accommodation for	.	33,876
Other denominations have provided accommodation for	.	19,170
		53,046

Leaving a population in Westminster unprovided for of 151,633 persons!!!"

Here, then, are extensive districts for which voluntaryism has had full liberty and strong encouragement to provide religious accomodation, and yet they are in the state of destitution described by Mr. Ainslie. During a long series of generations the casual principle has built chapels for only 19,170 persons, out of more than a hundred and fifty thousand; and these not for those who most needed them, and were least able to erect or support them; but almost exclusively for a portion of the population which had the will and the ability to pay for sittings, and to support their pastors: leaving the great mass of the most poor, and ignorant, and depraved, to perish for lack of knowledge. And yet with such palpable proofs of failure on every side, we are required to break up our parochial system, and to commit the whole population to casual agency.

But it will be said that the parochial principle has failed also. We deny it; we affirm that it has not been fairly applied. In Norwich much more might have been, and ought to have been, effected by its numerous clergy; and we have no wish to spare the delinquents: but a principle is not proved bad because it has not been duly worked: and if so little has been done with endowed churches, still less would have been done without them. At present we are speaking of the principle, not of the causes which impeded its energy, and which have prevailed in Norwich more than in most places. Still the argument recurs, Why, if voluntaryism was able and willing to supply the lack of national church service, did it not do so? If the clergy were idle,

or did not preach the Gospel faithfully and zealously, or diligently look after their parishes in pastoral labours, there was all the more scope for external voluntaryism; and the greater was either its guilt, or its feebleness, or both, in not doing what it is affirmed to be abundantly able and willing to do.

But the statistics of Westminster apply more generally; and we scruple not to say that the main reason why the Established Church did not do much more, was that it was grievously restricted in its efforts; being thwarted and crippled on every side. The most zealous clergymen, in the largest parishes, could not procure the building of new churches for their perishing population. Parliament would not defray the expense, and the Dissenters would not allow parish vestries to do so; instead, therefore, of the national principle, there was no resource but internal voluntaryism. But even internal voluntaryism was not allowed to work; it was prevented by the laws of patronage, and innumerable other obstacles; so that while any man might build a score meeting-houses without impediment, the Established Church was shackled in all its movements. The experiment was made of giving dissent a monopoly; and if the casual principle is sound, there ought not to be a single spot where a church was needed unsupplied with a meeting-house. There was no restriction upon the multiplication of dissenting teachers; but there was an almost absolute prohibition upon the division and subivision of parishes, and the importation of additional clergymen.

It will be replied, that we take for granted that the clergy were anxious to do their duty, and their flocks to aid their efforts; whereas the objector says, that the church was supine, and that all establishments are usually so, except when they are mischievous. Now we are not denying this supineness; we confess it, we deplore it: but voluntaryism is not entitled to cast the first stone, as this supineness was all in its favour. But what we mean to express is, that this very supineness arose, in no small measure, from oppression. Had parishes been allowed to be divided, and churches to be built wherever wanted, and adequate funds been provided from the public purse, either by Parliament or parochially, and interested or jealous patronage and soul-starving etiquette been made to yield to the paramount claims of perishing millions, there would not, by the blessing of God, have been wanting zeal, piety, and liberality, upon the part either of the clergy or the laity, to carry on the work. The supineness alluded to, instead of being against our argument, is a part of it. Almost every thing was so administered as not to make the church active, but to keep it quiet. It needed a revival: but revivalism was almost the inevitable purveyor to dissent. The supply was not accommodated to the demand; and the demand therefore either ceased, or migrated elsewhere, as in the case of the Methodists. The parochial system, which implies a new church and an additional clergyman wherever wanted, was confined to old populations and old endowments; nor was Church of England voluntaryism allowed to operate towards supplying the deficiency. What, then, could be expected but what took place? Dissent has found abundance of thorny scourges to lacerate us with in the wastes which we left to nourish thistles and briars; and taunts us with our uninclosed wilds, as if they were illustrations of our garden principle, instead of exceptions to it.

AMERICAN TESTIMONY TO THE INTEGRITY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

For the Christian Observer.

In our volumes for 1833, p. 245, and 1834, p. 362, we adverted to the charges which had been brought by Mr. Curtis, and a committee of Dissenting ministers, against the text of our current version of the Scriptures as printed at the authorized presses. A minute of the sub-committee, dated June 13, 1832, and signed by Dr. Henderson, Dr. Cox, and Dr. Bennett, urged "a speedy return to the standard text, which has been wantonly abandoned:" but it was considered "expedient to wait till the reprint of the edition of 1611, now printing in Oxford, be before the public." We do not blame the objectors for their anxiety to preserve the integrity of the authorized text; but it might have been quite as "expedient" to wait for the forthcoming reprint, before they declared so peremptorily that it had been "wantonly abandoned:" not merely altered, modified, improved, or even damaged, as the case might be, but "abandoned;" and this not for any good reason, or supposed good reason, or even by casualty, but "wantonly;" that is, from mere caprice, or from set purpose to do wrong, or, as Dr. Johnson defines the word, "frolicsomely, gaily, and sportively." If the curators of the licensed presses had really acted thus, it would have been not only "expedient," but a solemn duty, to make them retrace their steps by "a speedy return to the standard text," without waiting for the Oxford reprint: for though that reprint was very important, had the question been to examine the extent of alteration, and the comparative merit of various readings, punctuations, italics, marginal notes, and headings, it had nothing to do with the question whether wanton abandonment—a gross breach of trust and duty—was to be sanctioned.

In 1833 the promised literal reprint was given to the world; and then it became evident to every person who would take the trouble to collate the edition of 1611 with modern editions, that the text had been, not "wantonly abandoned," but had been carefully revised and corrected; a fact well known to every Biblical scholar, and mentioned to the honour of the revisors, especially the University of Oxford, by a host of Biblical critics.

In our review of Dean Turton's able and conclusive publication on the subject (Christ. Observer, 1834, p. 362), we endeavoured to shew the true bearings of the question. First, there had been revision; that was not doubted. Secondly, the revision was not made, or sanctioned, except tacitly and by implication, by ecclesiastical or legislative authority; there had been no royal commission of revision, nor were all the alterations made at one time: but successive editors, particularly Dr. Blayney, acting most conscientiously and under what they considered competent authority, had endeavoured to improve the punctuation, the italics, the headings and running titles, the marginal translations of proper names, the chronology, and the parallel references; for, be it remembered, there is no charge *of their having tampered with the translation.* The most important alterations are in the typographical distinction (now Italics, as in the black letter copies, Roman), which indicates what words are in the Greek or Hebrew, and what are only supplementary to convey the sense in

English. Mr. Curtis's most astounding item comes under this prolific head.

Two questions now arise. The first is, "Are the alterations improvements?" This we have no hesitation in answering in the affirmative. We do not mean that every single correction is for the better; but comparing a modern edition with that of 1611, there can be no question that there has been great and most necessary improvement. The edition of 1611 was inconsistent with itself; it was full of anomalies; it was deformed by typographical blunders; it was falsely punctuated; and it included in the text many words which are now justly italicised; and its headings and margins were far inferior to those of our modern copies. We need not pause to prove or illustrate these statements, as the committee which affirmed that the text of 1611 had been "wantonly abandoned," and ought to be speedily restored, have tacitly, if not avowedly, "abandoned" their declaration, and no longer express a wish to effect a return to the old exemplar. We are far from reproaching them for this. They conscientiously remonstrated against what they considered a corrupt text; but upon a further review of the whole question, they think it best to let well alone.

But there is, we said, a second question; namely, "Have we any right to retain the revised text, even though it should be clearly preferable to that of 1611?" Now we have no scruple in saying that the alterations were not made with due regularity; nor is it very clear how, or when, or by what authority, many of them were admitted. Dean Turton has discovered that what Mr. Curtis and his friends considered the modern innovation of making the text consistent with itself in the matter of Italics, may be traced back to a Bible published in 1638, the revised and improved text of which was printed from in after years. Archbishop Laud was then in the plenitude of his power; the control of the press was committed to him; and he took great pains to see that Bibles and Prayer-books were correctly printed, inflicting heavy penalties on the printers for negligence. King James's version is the authorized translation; but there is no royal, or ecclesiastical, or legislative authentication of the typography of 1611; there were no corrected sealed copies, as in the case of our present Book of Common Prayer; the early editions do not correspond with each other; and we find in that of 1611, the same expression differently printed in the same book, the same chapter, and even the same verse. Careful revision was therefore needed; and though this has been illegitimately carried beyond mere typography, it were better now to legitimate, by due authority, what was done well, though irregularly, than to go back to the faulty exemplar of 1611. Had the discussion taken the course which seemed likely four or five years ago, we do not think it would have been possible to let the matter rest where it now does. The public would have demanded some guarantee that new Blayneys shall not be permitted in future to exercise the office of discretional revisors; and an effort would have been made to procure a standard text, allowing only typographical, not editorial, corrections. But the oblivion of the controversy shews that no jealousy is now felt, no danger is apprehended. Nor needs there; for the text is conventionally settled and received; the printing is correct beyond all precedent; and the multiplication of copies, the permanency of stereotype, and the watchfulness of contending sects, preclude all fear of arbitrary revision.

We have premised these remarks chiefly as an introduction to the following important document which has just reached us from America, and which we have great pleasure in inserting.

"Many friends of the Society are aware, probably, that suspicions were awakened, a few years since in England, in regard to the integrity of the present English Bible. Charges of numerous and wide departures from the first edition of the translators had been freely circulated. Many letters and some pamphlets were published to substantiate those charges.

"In these circumstances the authorized printers of the Bible at the Oxford University published a fac-simile of the first edition of King James, issued in 1611, in order that it might be compared with modern editions. This fac-simile copy is prepared with great minuteness, not only as respects the text, but the orthography, punctuation, and even the embellishments. Having procured one of these copies, your Board felt it their duty to institute a rigid comparison between it and the standard copy of this Society. To secure perfect fairness as well as thoroughness in such an undertaking, a Supervising Committee was appointed by the Board, *consisting of one member from each religious denomination connected with the Society.* A skilful proof-reader was first directed to compare the early and the modern copy, word for word, and to note down all the discrepancies. Professor Bush, the Editor of the Society's publications, having in the library a great variety of Bibles issued during the last three centuries, was then requested to go through the same, and learn where and when the changes found commence. The Committee then, each with a copy of some age in hand, carefully followed the Editor and examined his investigations. The whole subject was then laid before the entire Board for their adjudication. The task has been arduous, though one of great interest. While it has been found that numerous variations exist between the early and the present copies of the English Bible, *it is also found that they pertain only to unimportant particulars; such as capital letters, commas, italic words, &c. not affecting the sense.* It has been a matter of unfeigned satisfaction to the Board to find, on such careful investigation, that the books which they have sent forth from the Depository have been so conformed in meaning to the first editions issued under the eye of the translators. Little motive has been presented to make any changes. Those which have been made were of trivial importance, and usually for the purpose of return and conformation to the early copies. *This investigation of the Board has placed that incomparable translation of King James on higher ground, in their estimation, than ever; and their hope is that every friend of divine truth, using the English tongue, will seek to guard that translation, in future, from all emendations.* No Bible, among any people, has ever had such sway over its readers as that now referred to; a fact to be accounted for, in part at least, by the wise principles on which it was made. It was obviously prepared in a spirit of Christian compromise, [fairness] as well as with great ability and faithfulness. It was so made that to this day sincere lovers of the Bible, of every religious creed, appeal to it as authority. How different would have been the result had it appeared in a sectarian garb. Other versions with different party costumes would then have followed; the confidence of the unlearned Christian in what he read would have been weakened, and the rejecter of revelation would have rejoiced in finding a series of clashing versions, all claiming origin from the same inspired mind. Your Board cannot but express their solicitude that the wise and salutary example of those who prepared the English Bible, may be imitated by those who are called to the responsible work of making translations into the pagan tongues. While no unfaithful versions should be encouraged, none which misstate in any degree the mind of the Spirit, *they should still be so made that all serious readers of every name can use them. The Bible should itself convey but one sentiment to any nation. And this desirable object is attainable by domesticating, in every tongue, those few Greek words about which good men of every modern age, at least, are unable to think alike.* As the Greek language is that in which the New Testament was originally written, and as numerous words now in the English Bible were transferred from that tongue without inconvenience, your Board can see no solid reason for not making such transfers into all tongues as shall enable the friends of divine truth to use the same version. They are happy to learn that this course has been adopted with perfect facility by the missionaries at the Sandwich Islands and other mission stations."

We heartily respond to these statements and recommendations of our American brethren. Attempts have been often made to represent King James's Bible as a sectarian work. The Romanists maintained

their Douay and Rhenish misversion against it; a portion of the early Presbyterians and Independents wished to substitute the Geneva version for it, chiefly on account of its using, as was befitting, various well-known ecclesiastical and non-translated words; the modern Socinian would supersede it by an "Improved" heretical version; and the Anabaptists are alleging that it is sectarian to employ the Grecised word "baptize" instead of immerse, and are making a schism in the Bible Society, because it refuses to aid new translations which use some disputed special term, instead of one general and adequate to the original. Under these circumstances, the above united testimony of our American brethren of various denominations is highly valuable and important.

SCRIPTURE NOT INTENDED TO TEACH PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

YOUR eloquent, and better than eloquent, correspondent, J. M. H., in your Number for September, p. 538, has inadvertently made the Apostle St. James (Chap. i. 17) anticipate the Copernican system. That inspired writer, he says: "May perhaps intend to *compare* the sun, amid all these apparent revolutions, *immoveably fixed*, and looking, with calm and undisturbed majesty, *upon the other bodies as they revolve around him*; amid all this seeming fickleness and inconstancy, unchanged in nature and in attributes; operating by constant and immutable laws; while all those vicissitudes result *from the varied aspect which the earth presents to him*," &c.

This exposition, had it been admitted by the Church of Rome, would have shielded Galileo from the terrors of the Inquisition; the learned fathers of which adduced the narratives of the shadow going back on the dial of Ahaz, and the sun standing still at the command of Joshua, in proof that it is the sun, and not the earth, which revolves; and they strove to refute his heresy by condemning him to imprisonment, and an ignominious recantation of his hypothesis, and a weekly repetition of the seven penitential psalms; and there is reason to suspect, by the repeated threat, if not the actual infliction, of bodily torture.

I doubt, however, whether your excellent correspondent really considers St. James as maintaining the Copernican doctrine. It certainly was not necessary to the infallibility of an inspired writer, that he should know that the sun, and not our planet, is the centre of what we now call the solar system. The sacred penmen were led by the Holy Ghost to use ordinary allusions as they found them established in the common language of daily life; and even professed philosophers do the same. Galileo himself would have said that the sun stood still over Gibeon, and the moon over the valley of Ajalon, and that the sun went back, not the earth forward, on the dial of Ahaz. The Bible would have been an unintelligible book to the multitude, and, if I may say it reverently, an absurd book to the wise, if it had metamorphosed human speech, in order to fit it to the abstractions of philosophy.

Your correspondent makes so good and beautiful a use of his illustration, that I should not have troubled myself or your readers about the anachronism, except for the sake of grounding on it the

general principle, that the Scriptures being given to us for moral and spiritual purposes, not for the gratification of curiosity, we are not to expect to find in them any physical truth which was not known, without direct revelation, at the time when they were written. They will not indeed contradict any physical truth; they will not be liable to confutation by subsequent discoveries; they may even illustrate such truth when known (as in the account of the creation and the deluge); but we are not to expect them to reveal it—I mean in a scientific manner, or for scientific purposes. If we look, for instance, for the outlines of a system of astronomy or geology, in the first chapter of Genesis, we look for what was not intended to be there. The Hutchesonian divines have done more injury to revelation by their honest mistake in this matter, than sceptical philosophers by their cavils; for an injudicious friend is often more dangerous than a weak, though malignant, enemy. The alleged difficulties which have been urged from the discoveries of modern geology, do not affect the sacred text, but only the systems of cosmogony which have been currently derived from it. The book of Joshua has survived the ignorant alarms of the anti-Copernicans; and the book of Genesis will remain equally unscathed by the discoveries, however unexpected, of geology, whatever may become of men's fallible interpretations.

M. G.

REPLY TO ZENAS ON THE PRINCIPLES OF DISSENTERS; WITH A NOTE ON SOME RECENT DISSENTING ARGUMENTS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

YOUR correspondent Zenas, in his paper on Bishop Hall, in your No. for September, p. 545, has made a grievous mistake as to the views of modern Dissenters, which I rely upon your integrity to correct. He says:

"Will it be now honestly affirmed by any right-minded dissenter that the factious opposition against Bishop Hall and his church was really useful to the cause of truth and religion: and is any one among us now prepared to contend that the silencing of this good man, and the suppression of his invaluable exertions, was a blessing to the country at large? Must not the direct contrary be rather conceded? and why then, I would ask, is this experiment to be tried over again? Has history been written in vain, and do we resolve to use it only as the stern-lights of our vessel, permitting it, indeed, to throw a light over the track which has been passed, but not over that which lies before us?"

Now, Sir, though the above is verbally an implication that modern Dissenters would not say that the cause of religion was furthered by the conduct pursued towards Bishop Hall; yet it is equally an implication (otherwise why ask the question?) that they consider "factious opposition" to bishops, and "silencing" them, to be "useful to the cause of truth and religion;" and that they wish to "try over again the experiment" of persecution for conscience sake.

Your correspondent in this matter does not clearly distinguish things which differ. Modern Dissenters would certainly suppress national ecclesiastical establishments, because they consider them contrary to Scripture; and whether the establishment be Protestant or Papist, Episcopalian or Presbyterian, makes no difference in their estimation. In this respect they would oppose alike Hall or Bonner; Calvin or Arminius, Ken or Matthew Henry; Dr. Chalmers or Bishop Daniel Wilson. They would take, whether from cathedral, or

church, or chapel, from bishop, priest, deacon, pastor, or minister, all national aid; they would disfranchise of what they consider usurped power a Hall as decidedly as a Laud; and an Owen or a Howe, as a Hall; and if your correspondent means, Did good arise to the cause of religion by abolishing episcopacy as a national establishment? they reply, Yes; though that good was unhappily neutralised by setting up another national establishment in its place.

But if your correspondent means, Did good arise from silencing Hall as an episcopal clergyman; was it right to interfere with his ordaining or confirming, or to suppress the church to which he belonged as an ecclesiastical or spiritual communion; is persecution, or "factious opposition" in any shape warrantable? the Dissenter upon principle replies, No; it was not right to prevent that good man's exercising his ministry how and where he pleased, provided he did not cause civil disturbance; and this not upon account of his being a good man, or preaching scriptural doctrine, but upon the general principle of religious liberty. Modern Dissenters would not have disturbed Hall, for the same reason that they would not have disturbed Socinus or Servetus. They would take from the best man, or the best church, the aid of the state; they would give to the worst full liberty to promulgate opinions; so long as no civil offence was committed. Your correspondent seems to think that he has a good argumentum ad hominem when he asks if any religious benefit arose from forcibly silencing such a man as Hall; but its edge is blunted by the reply, No; nor by forcibly silencing any body, Carlile or Paine not excepted. The modern Dissenter reprobates the conduct of the persecuting Puritans, just as he does that of the mob of 1780, which burnt the house of Dr. Priestley, or of the bigots who kindled the fires of Smithfield; except so far as under the special circumstances of the days of Charles the First, temporary tyranny was necessary to effect ultimate liberty; and men were obliged to keep down others to prevent being kept down themselves. The modern Dissenter does not justify this but as a case of dire necessity.

I do not imagine that your correspondent will see the force of these distinctions; for the advocates for national ecclesiastical endowments, in settling the question of what shall be legally established, take into their view the consideration of what is true or false, scriptural or unscriptural, or more or less useful; and thus Dr. Chalmers, though a Presbyterian upon conviction, upholds the Church of England as a national establishment, yet would oppose the Church of Rome under similar circumstances. But the Dissenter looks to the general principle; he is as much a Dissenter in Scotland as in England; and would have been so in Switzerland under Calvin, or Germany under Luther, not less than in Italy under the Pope, or in Turkey under the Grand Mufti. The battle must be fought upon the broad ground; I have placed it on that ground; and that there may be no mistake, I inform him that, to his question respecting Bishop Hall, Dissenters reply, Yes, as regards national establishment; No, as regards Christian churchship; and if he notices these remarks, he must address himself to that two-fold view; nor must he mix it up with the question of "factious opposition," or of the severity or contumely used towards a venerable servant of God, which no Dissenter ought to defend, though of course there may be bigots of all persuasions.

NUCLEUS.

*** We have received various communications, at different times, to the effect of the foregoing paper, particularly in reference to the celebrated dictum of Mr. Binney. We leave Zenas to his own explanation, if he wishes one; but we have a few remarks to add on the general question. It is said that Mr. Binney and the Dissenters are misrepresented, as if they wished to put down episcopacy, whereas they only wish to dissever it from the State; as if they spoke of the *church*, whereas they mean only the *establishment*. Now we beg leave to say that we have never made any mistake in the matter; we have always clearly stated the distinction, and applied our arguments to it. Men may approve the doctrines and rites of the Church of England, and yet object to its being established, as do many of our episcopalian brethren in the United States; or they may approve of an establishment, and yet object to some things in the doctrines or discipline of the Anglican Church; as do the members of the Church of Scotland, and as did the early non-conformists in England, notwithstanding they considered it the duty of Christian legislatures, to entwine Christianity, like a golden thread, with civil institutions. Modern Dissenters, for the most part, embrace both objections.

It may be that in popular apprehension there is not always a very clear distinction on these subjects; for men are apt to go with a party, and to love or hate in gross, not in detail: and without much trouble of thinking, or nice questionings as to the whys and wherefores of things; and our ordinary ecclesiastical nomenclature is itself ambiguous; for when a man says that he approves or disapproves of the Church of England, or Scotland, or Switzerland, or of the Established Church in either of those countries, it is not certain from the wording, whether he speaks of the Church or of the Establishment, or of both; yet the ideas are perfectly distinct. The full expression for the Church of England, or the English national church, would be "That branch of Christ's holy catholic church legislatively established in England." It might be a true branch of Christ's church without being nationally established; or be nationally established without being a true branch of Christ's church. We cordially approve of it as a church, and we also cordially approve of its being established; but it would be preposterous to blend the two; and it would be most injurious also to the cause which we espouse, to do so, as we should thereby lose the advantage of the two concentric circumvallations of argument by which the Church of England is defended; and should be advocating our faith as if it were only in the "books and parchments" of parliament, and not of Holy Scripture.

We should not have troubled our readers with these remarks, but for the pertinacity with which Dissenters accuse us of wilfully and corruptly—not by mere mistake, even if there had been any—but wilfully and corruptly confounding these two points, in order to render their arguments invidious. Take one example among many. A Dissenting writer, calling himself John Search, who by a deceptive title-page beguiled not a few churchmen into buying his wares, under the impression that they were purchasing a series of extracts to prove, in opposition to Mr. Binney's dictum, that the Church of England is a blessing and not a curse; and who, in a subsequent pamphlet, is obliged to acknowledge the fact; his own bookseeller having declared—(for the writer having adopted a fictitious name, the aggrieved parties could not apply to himself)—"that several clergymen [not one in many probably of the defrauded purchasers] had brought back their copies to him, wishing their money returned, and complained that they had bought it under a mistake;" and who, moreover, so far from feeling grief or shame at the trick, much less offering to refund the money, tells with exultation how much he was "*amused* by the circumstance;" this same John Search, among

his other notable researches, has discovered that the Christian Observer has "for years been misrepresenting Mr. Binney" in the matter under consideration; and thereby been guilty of "very great moral and controversial delinquencies." Hard words these; now to the proof. He quotes us as saying:

"You (the Dissenter) will swing us off on the hinge of *an abstract principle*, and in the words of good Mr. Binney will tell us—'I am an enemy to *the Esablishment*.' 'The *Established* Church is a great national evil; it is an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land; it destroys more souls than it saves; and its end is most devoutly to be wished by every lover of God and man.' Upon the rashness of a mortal man daring to pretend to read the inscrutable book of the divine counsels, and to assert without *if* or *but*, that fewer souls are saved than would be if *the Church of England* did not exist, it is not necessary for us to descant. If Mr. Binney can really prove what he has asserted, there is an end of discussion. We depone, and we have endeavoured, and we believe satisfactorily, to prove, that a Church *Establishment* may be, and is, 'a means of grace.'"

Now let Mr. Binney himself be the judge if it were possible for us to express in terms more clear and distinct, that he was objecting to our church, not as a spiritual communion, but as an establishment; that he was not urging against us questions of doctrine, but the "abstract principle;" we quoted his own words; he was "an enemy" to "the Establishment;" "the established church," "the church *of England*" as established; and our proposition in reply was that "a church establishment may be (in the abstract) and is (in pure churches) a means of grace." The degree in which the doctrines or ceremonies of the Anglican communion are right or wrong, was not the question; nor could we be so absurdly uncharitable as to suppose that Mr. Binney, or any other Dissenter, does not believe that a truly pious minister of our church may "both save himself and them that hear him;" though as a national establishment we ought to be extirpated.

Now will it be credited that John Search, who is put forward so prominently as expressing the opinions and feelings of the Dissenters, in commenting on the above passage, asserts that we have corruptly garbled Mr. Binney's words, to make it appear that he predicated of "the church" what he predicated only of the "establishment;" that he is an "enemy" to episcopacy as well to the *national* church of England. He is doubtless opposed to both, as thinking both unscriptural; but we carefully confined our statement, quoting his own words, to his being "an enemy" to the national "establishment."

So much continues to be said by the Dissenters, in writing and print, in private and in public, of an unfair use having been made of Mr. Binney's dictum, by omitting the context, that it may be as well, even thus late, to quote the the passage verbatim, from the pamphlet of Search himself, who reprints it, in order to shew that the Christian Observer, for sundry wicked and malicious purposes, "could *pick out, omit, and mutilate,* Mr. Binney's words," after the fashion following:

"1st. Omitting Mr. B.'s explanation of the word 'enemy,' which distinguishes not only between persons and things, but between things, viz. between the Episcopal Church and the political Establishment. 2nd. Changing the whole series of Mr. B.'s statement from a qualified to a positive form, by omitting the qualifying sentence before the series, and the word 'that' before each. 3rd. Omitting the strongest possible form of 'if or but' in the phrase 'right or wrong, this is my belief.' 4th. Reasoning on the sense which, by these means, he himself puts on Mr. B.'s words as if it were his, calling 'opinion,' knowledge, 'conviction,' assertion, and complaining of the absence of what is really in the passage. 5th. Using language in relation to his 'belief' respecting Dissent—his 'conviction,' as to the future,—and his notions as to the obvious means of grace,—as capable of being turned into 'knowledge' and 'assertion' as Mr. B.'s—to require, as much, the exercise of 'prescience,'—and to be as certainly 'a presumptuous party estimate.' These things are as obvious as they can possibly be."

Now, if all these crimes had really been committed against Mr. Binney, it would be a solemn duty, even thus late, to endeavour to make amends. Let the reader then judge whether anything in the "qualifying sentence," "belief," and so forth, does in the smallest degree convict churchmen of detraction for saying that Mr. Binney declares himself—and not in "a qualified" but "a positive" form—"an enemy to the Establishment," on the ground that it is his "deep, serious, religious, conviction" that it "destroys more souls than it saves;" or that, in quoting the condensed dictum without always quoting the whole passage, they studiously misrepresented him as being an enemy to the "persons" of the members of the "Episcopal church," whereas no man alive dreamed that this passage was meant to convey more than that he is an enemy to the Establishment, whatever may be his opinion of the Church of England as a religious communion, or of the toleration which he would afford to it, as a dis-established church, in common with the toleration not withheld from Jews, Turks, or Pagans. The following are his words:

"Truth cannot be injured by fair and full discussion, and by open and uncompromising statements. I have no hesitation about saying, that I am an enemy to the Establishment; and I do not see that a churchman need hesitate to say that he is an enemy to Dissent. Neither of us would mean the persons of Churchmen or Dissenters, nor the episcopal or other portions of the universal Church; but the principle of the national religious establishment, which we should respectively regard as deserving, universally, opposition or support. It is with me, I confess, a matter of deep, serious, religious conviction, that the Established Church is a great national evil; that it is an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land; that it destroys more souls than it saves; and that, therefore, its end is most devoutly to be wished by every lover of God and man. Right or wrong, this is my belief; and I should feel not the slightest offence if a Churchman were to express himself to me in precisely the same words with respect to Dissent."

Churchmen are quite as anxious as Dissenters can be, and for a much better reason, that "the church" should not be confounded with "the establishment;" and it is one of the few good things in the Oxford Tracts, that they always keep this distinction clearly in view. It is the Dissenters who unfairly blend things which so essentially differ. Ask nine out of ten Dissenters why they object to our Church, and they will begin telling of something they disapprove of in the Establishment; ask them why they disapprove of the Establishment, and they will begin specifying something they dislike in the Prayer-book. They have good reason to mix the two questions; we have good reason to separate them; for even Robert Hall was constrained to admit that the bare principles of Dissent are too dry and cold to make many converts, without spicing them with practical grievances; and the Eclectic reviewers, in like manner, contend for the necessity of occasional good round abuse of the Established Church, in order to keep alive the abstract principle of non-conformity.

We are at a loss to know why any Dissenter should think that Churchmen wish to blink the actual question. Did Dr. Chalmers blink it in his admirable lectures? No; he took it up in its most simple form, as numerous Anglican writers have done; and this not only in books for the learned, but in popular tracts. We will obtrude, in proof, a quotation from "Six Dialogues on a Church Establishment," published about seven years ago by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Let the following passage shew whether Churchmen, with a view to hold up Dissenters to obloquy, represent them as necessarily vituperating "the Church" when they are vituperating "the Establishment." The passage rather leans to the contrary mistake of representing the Dissenter, for argument's sake, as far more candid in his concessions than he usually is in fact.

"My brother-in-law was a Dissenter, and Mr. Dickson, the Independent minis-

ter, whose preaching he attended, and whom he has joined with myself in the executorship, came back with the mourners after the solemn service. 'I do not like that Church service at all, Mr. Dickson,' said a forward young man who happened to be present; 'it is very popish.' 'And why, Mr. Timkins?' replied Mr. Dickson: 'I do not myself, as you know, approve of some expressions in it, but on the present occasion I found it peculiarly solemn and impressive; it was uttered from the heart, and it went to the heart; we ought, Mr. Timkins, to be candid; my own objections in these matters lie much deeper than the wording of a service.' 'Ay, Mr. Dickson,' rejoined Timkins, 'I know what you mean: you object to all set forms.' 'Why, not exactly so, Mr. Timkins: there is nothing wrong in forms as such, whether forms of ritual, or forms of prayer and praise; and the forms of the Church of England are in general excellent, many of them eminently beautiful; and the pious members of the Church profit in the use of them, and doubtless find conscientious reasons for approving even of those which to you and me seem objectionable.' 'Yes, yes,' returned Timkins, 'I see where you are: you do not like men-made-parsons; there is no warrant for Bishops in the word of God.' 'I am sorry, Mr. Timkins,' replied Mr. Dickson, 'to oppose you, as if for the sake of quibbling; but the question of episcopacy is one which you have not studied; I have; and though I am not myself an episcopalian, I can readily admit that a pious and honest episcopalian may feel as conscientiously convinced on his side as I on mine; and I should certainly not think this alone a reason for dissenting from the Church; I should be very sorry to call such a servant of Christ as the excellent rector of this parish a man-made-minister. I could not in conscience frequent his church; but I cannot doubt that he is truly called by the Holy Ghost to the office of the Christian ministry, and that his labours have been eminently blessed of God to the spiritual welfare of his flock.' 'O then,' rejoined Timkins, 'I conclude you do not like the rags of popery—fonts, and surplices, and steeples, and so forth.' 'No reasonable man, Mr. Timkins,' continued Mr. Dickson, 'no Christian of an enlightened mind in the present day would rend the Church of Christ for scruples like this. I presume the rector attributes no more holiness to his surplice than I to my gown. There used to be vehement disputes about the lawfulness of appointing ceremonies, not sinful in themselves, and intended for edification, but not prescribed by the word of God; but no Dissenter in the nineteenth century dwells upon points like these. When the basis of a church is solid there is room for amendment in the details: my chief objection to the Church of England is, that it is established by law; I should equally object to any other national Church establishment, even were all the doctrines sound, and all the rites scriptural. I lay it down as a fundamental principle, that it is the duty of every true disciple of Christ to withdraw himself from a national Church, and to bear his testimony against all act-of-parliament religion.'"

Upon this general principle the question is argued in this Christian Knowledge Tract, and in numerous other publications; and yet we are now to be told that Churchmen artfully confound what Mr. Binney and other Dissenters say of the Establishment with what they say of the Church, in order to expose them to popular odium. We confidently tell John Search and his friends, that even if in these mournful days they should gain over a majority of infidels, papists, and political Dissenters, in both houses of parliament, to pull down the national fabric, and deceive the sovereign into a supposition that she would not be perjured by putting her hand to such an act of ungodly legislation, the Church, as a church, would still flourish, though millions would lose the blessings of her influence as a national institution.

There is an extraordinary fallacy which runs thoughout the writings of modern Dissenters, and which, gross as it is, may be worth noticing, as it deceives some superficial observers. Mr. Binney, for instance, remarks, that the Dissenter only says that he is an enemy to the Establishment, and the Churchman need not hesitate to say that he is an enemy to dissent; and thus they are even; and John Search makes it the burden of his pamphlet that the Christian Observer is every thing that is bad, because, while it condemns the language of Mr. Binney, it specifies the evils which would result from the subversion of our national Church Establishment. "It seems to me," says Search, "as if the most fertile

ingenuity could not have produced a more instructive specimen of inconsistency, *modesty*, and misrepresentation." Now in spite of these hard words, the alleged parallelism, we repeat, is grounded on a gross fallacy. The fallacy consists in comparing *a thing* and a *no-thing*; a church and a nonentity. Our national ecclesiastical establishment is positive, actual, tangible; it is seen in its churches, its clergy, its parishes, and its provision for sacred ordinances; it is a visible branch of Christ's universal church. But dissent is not a church; it is merely a negation, an abstraction, a minus against a plus, a pulling down not a building up. The Evangelical Dissenters, when they speak of dissent, are so circumscribed in their own narrow circle, that they seem to forget the wide world around them; arguing as though dissent were a religion; whereas it is merely the negative quality of not conforming to a particular creed, or church, or establishment. Mr. Binney's chapel is not dissent, or Dr. Pye Smith's, or John Search's. Dissent is not evangelical doctrine detached from episcopacy; nor is it any definite system or class of opinion; it is merely "non-conformity," as it used very properly to be called; and, in this large abstract sense, Jews, Romanists, infidels, and sects of all persuasions, are as much Dissenters, as Baptists, Independents, Quakers, or Socinians.

Now if John Search and his friends will just substitute the phrase *pulling down national churches*, for the equivocal word "dissent," the unsoundness and injustice of their animadversions will be apparent to every unprejudiced person. Some years ago a portion of the populace wished to "pull down" the Bank of England. Now, if we had shewn the great evils which would result from doing so, and pointed out what we considered the benefits arising to the country from that establishment, would it be sense or honesty to reply, "Those bank-defenders are mighty consistent and modest people; they complained of a man who said, Destroy the bank, because it was in his opinion an evil, and yet they say that its destruction would be an evil." But this illustration, though apt in part, falls short, very far short, of the extent of the case which it is intended to illustrate. Men may doubt about the merits of the Bank of England; but neither Mr. Binney nor John Search can deny that much positive, yea incalculable benefit to souls, has arisen from the ministrations of the Church of England; they must admit, that, wrong as they think its construction to be, and ill as they say it is worked, it is nevertheless a channel through which life and salvation flow to vast numbers of our fellow creatures; but they wish to break up this mighty engine, on the assumption that it destroys more souls than it saves. Now Churchmen, not in the posture of attack, but of defence, reply that the extinction of so much real good, the injury to those souls which it is admitted are saved through its instrumentality, would be a most fearful experiment; whereupon it is complained that the honest farmer speaks as strongly against rick-burning, as the rick-burner against ricks; and that if he found fault with the denouncers of ricks, it was inconsistent in him to denounce rick-burning. The farmer was not the incendiary; he was only repelling incendiarism. The comparison, as respects the abstract question of establishments, is not between a parish church and a meeting-house; but between the former and an airy dream. The Dissenter says that the void will be filled up by evangelical chapels; but this is mere assumption; it is not a thing proved or provable; all the proof lies on the other side; for there is a far stronger bias in corrupt human nature to go back to irreligion, than to advance to spiritual-mindedness. We say to the Dissenter, why tear down our national altars? Why, for an abstract principle, a conjecture, an experiment, destroy so much that is allowedly good, and so much more good in germ? And because we argue thus, modestly, scripturally, and defensively; pleading for a

positive means of grace against a negation; deprecating a ruinous demolition of our invaluable national religious bank, and leaving the site a mass of black ruins, under the fond fancy that some better voluntary fabric might spring up on the spot; we are accused of misrepresentation, malevolence, and we know not what. If Churchmen were asking the legislature to destroy the Dissenting chapels, as the Dissenters are imploring it to destroy the National Establishment, the cases would be parallel; but not till then.

We have said, that all this proposed demolition is in virtue of an abstract notion about what is called "dissent upon principle." We certainly thought so, because we found it so declared in all the Dissenting manuals, from the days of Dr. Towgood up to the year 1838. The much-vaunted Non-conformist Catechism said so; and the maxim was pithily expressed in the Velvet Cushion controversy, in the oft-quoted aphorism that all conscientious men are bound to dissent from an Established Church, because it is established, "*even though the doctrines preached be the doctrines of the Gospel, and the ministers practise what they preach.*" This is what we have called repelling us by an abstract principle. But the illumination of dissent has of late become so strong, that what was till lately dissent upon abstract principle, is now dissent upon *assumption*. John Search, for example, is pleased, on behalf of his brethren, to say:

"I have proved, in the course of this letter, that Dissenters ground their conviction, not on 'the hinge of an abstract principle' in relation to an establishment, after conceding 'services, clergy, &c., to be perfection itself,' but on the assumed fact of the tendency of 'the principle and operation' of an establishment to produce the opposite of all this."

The new basis of dissent for 1838, we here learn, is not "upon principle;" but upon an "assumed fact," though this assumed fact is, after all, not "a fact;" but a "tendency" to a fact; or rather *the assumption of a tendency to a fact!* A very quicksandy foundation this for the erection of a solid edifice! We are to pull down the national churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland, upon the assumption of a tendency to the fact, that national churches are not "perfection itself." Controversial combatants often "beg the question;" assume the very point in debate, and then argue from it; but they are not always so unskilful as to acknowledge that they have done so. But the Dissenters of 1838 "assume" that national churches ought to be subverted, and therefore *they ought to be subverted!* They lay it down as "an assumed fact," that the churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland, destroy more souls than they save, and therefore they ought to be destroyed in turn.

We have no fault to find with the construction of their syllogism; it is very clear and logical; but we have plenty of fault to find with the charity, and modesty, and veracity, of their assumptive premise. They only ask us to grant, without judge, jury, or witnesses, that a national church is a detected culprit; that it is suspected by its enemies of being suspected of suspicious tendencies to suspicious facts; and then forthwith its friends must in reason confess it guilty, and proceed to its condemnation.

There is a little inconvenience in this otherwise notable argument; that it will answer as well on the other side, or on any side. We might say, Churchmen ground their convictions "on the assumed fact" that the national establishments of England, Ireland, and Scotland, are, in the hands of God, instruments of great spiritual benefit; therefore, &c. Q. E. D. We do not assume this, for we can prove it; and we go beyond "tendencies" to "facts;" but rick-burners "assumed" that thrashing machines had a "tendency" which they did not like, and hence they became incendiaries.

We have "assumed" that this new dissenting argument is an advance upon the old ones; but in truth it is rather a grievous falling back. There was some shew of argument in the doctrine of dissent upon abstract principle; for if a national church is wrong in principle—that is, opposed to the revealed word of God—no excellence in details can make it right; but if the "abstract principle" be not insisted upon, but only certain assumed tendencies of fact, then we reply, that there may be two opinions as to these tendencies; also, that where they exist they may be counteracted; also, that better tendencies may overpower them; also, that there may be somewhat more reasonable ground to assume the bad tendency of banishing religion from the national counsels, than of consecrating them by it; of leaving masses of human beings to grope their way from heathenism, without any legislative provision for their spiritual instruction, than of affording them that aid; also, that dissent is not "perfection," but has its bad tendencies, though we need not "assume" the "facts" which prove this, as we can too easily cite them; and lastly, that if we are to break up every good institution because we may find flaws, or because of an assumption of some contingent imperfections which require to be guarded against in its working, we must break up all moral machinery of every kind, and wait for the millennium, before we engage in any work of piety or benevolence. We should like, as a curiosity, to see John Search's chapel, and schools, and societies, in order to witness for once something that has no tendency to imperfection.

Let not Dissenters boast too loudly about assumptions and presumed tendencies. There was a time when it assumed that the Evangelical Dissenters were a body of such spiritually-minded men, that they had no tendency to gravitate towards political strife or faction; it would have been deemed a stigma upon them that they would prefer to be represented in Parliament by a friend of Tom Paine, rather than by a much esteemed servant of Christ; that their publications would laud licentious novels, if their author happened to be a zealous radical; or that they would eulogise a Channing, and vituperate a Chalmers; or that they would uphold demagogues, for purposes of political ambition; and, instead of enjoying their civil and religious privileges, and living in holy peace and love, would run from Cornwall to Caithness, crying "Agitate, agitate, agitate," with a view to pull down our national altars, and expose the nation to be overrun with popery, infidelity, and national heathenism. Yet all this, and much more, is "fact," in spite of presumption. Let the reader mark the following passage in the works of Robert Hall, in reply, says his Editor, to charges brought against the Dissenters, such as that by Bishop Horsley, "that they were actuated by what were then termed Jacobinical motives, and by a desire to overthrow the Episcopalian form of church government." We are not about to discuss the justice or injustice of these statements, and much less to vindicate the proposition of Lord Sidmouth, for violating their rights and privileges; but we wish to shew that the piety and moderation which R. Hall "took for granted" was an ample guarantee for Dissenters wishing to keep aloof from political factions, "from scenes of tumult and noise," and rather to court "solitude and retirement," in order to cherish "the spirit of piety," has not proved in "fact," what it was "assumed" to be in theory. The passage is almost a libel by anticipation. He says:

"It will not, we hope, be deemed presumptuous if we take it for granted that the Dissenters, and especially that class of them who have signalized their zeal for the religious instruction of the poor, have really more piety than falls to the share of the great body of the people of England. But how is it possible for pious men to enter into a conspiracy, to overturn the constitution of their country, and to overwhelm everything in anarchy? For this purpose they must unite

themselves intimately with the infidel faction: they must make common cause with those detestable monsters whose pestilential breath has blasted, in other countries, everything cheering to the eye or refreshing to the heart. They must forget the infinite contrariety of principle which divides them; they must forget the daggers of these assassins, which, after destroying their enemies, they never fail to turn against their associates, impelled by an insatiable eagerness for destruction. They must put their fortune, their character, their life, in the hands of men with whom it would not be safe to trust themselves in a room. There is nothing more opposite than the spirit of faction and the spirit of piety. There enters into the composition of faction, a meddlesome and mischievous activity, blended with a callousness of heart. Devotion softens the temper; faction knows no delicacy in the choice of its society. It wants no other qualities in its associates than turbulence and discontent, a conscience which no crime can startle, and an impudence which no detection can confront. Devotion, alarmed at wickedness, and disgusted with folly, is apt to carry the principle of selection too far. Faction delights in scenes of tumult and noise, devotion in solitude and retirement. Faction busies itself with forming external movements, and values itself only on the change it produces in the situation of external objects; the treasures and conquests of religion are internal. Faction draws its nourishment from an overweening conceit of superior wisdom, accompanied with a proportionable contempt of the understanding and virtue of other men. The solid foundation of piety is laid in humility, or a deep conviction of our sinfulness and fallibility. I will not say that men of real piety have never strayed into factious enterprises; or have not, on some occasions, pushed their opposition to government too far; but it may be safely affirmed, that whenever they have done so, it must have arisen from an extraordinary concurrence of circumstances; generally from the oppression which makes a wise man mad: that it is most foreign to their genuine character, and that nothing is a more effectual antidote to political turbulence than the prevalence of piety."

We leave Robert Hall and modern Dissenters to settle these assumptions.

"STEALTHINESS" OF THE OXFORD TRACTS: *THE BREVIARY*, &c.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE Layman's Essays on the Church, reviewed in the last Number of the Christian Observer, confidently affirm, and the Christian Observer adopts the affirmation, that the editor of the Tract for the Times on the Breviary, approves of the prayers published by him; whereas he again and again expresses his disapprobation of many of them—and says that they are published in part to shew the deviation of the Church of Rome from the true standard. If I am accurate, you will, I am sure, think it right to apologise for the mistake, and to direct the attention of the writer of the Essays to the circumstances. Nothing can be more mischievous than fixing on valuable works, such as the "Essays," the charge of disingenuousness. — — —

*** The foregoing has reached us from the friendly hand of one who is no admirer of the Oxford Tracts, but who justly thinks that they ought to be dealt with in a spirit of justice and candour. We think so too, and are glad that our correspondent has favoured us with a note of his objection.

We leave the "Layman" to his own explanation. He is well able to defend himself. We are sure that he is incapable of wilful misrepresentation; and that if he has inadvertently conveyed a wrong impression, he will rejoice to remove it. What he said was, that the editor of the Oxford Tract on the Breviary, had "prepared and recommended for Protestant use" certain selections

from that work, and that among the prayers thus "re-appropriated," are those to the Virgin Mary. The Tract-writers had said:—

"It [the Breviary] may moreover suggest character and matter for our private devotions, over and above what our Reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public services; *a use* of it which will be but carrying out and completing what they have begun."

There is much more to the same effect; and as a practical exemplification of the principle of thus applying the Breviary to "Protestant use," there is added a service for Bishop Ken's day, March 21. The Layman apparently meant only to shew, by an exceptionable passage, what was the character of the work lauded; but he has laid himself open to the charge of including for Protestant use what the compilers had excluded. The Rev. G. Townsend, in his faithful, seasonable, and scriptural Charge, just published, entitled "The Doctrine of the Atonement to be taught without reserve; or the Clergy warned against the errors of a publication entitled Tracts for the Times, No. 8. *Ad Clerum*," has stated the matter with the requisite limitation; though we shall shew how little such feeble limitations, which occasionally occur in the Oxford Tracts, avail in counteracting their pernicious tendency. Indeed, our full belief is, that, practically, they render them more dangerous because more insidious; and that Dr. Wiseman and his brethren are "wise in their generation," in recommending and circulating these Janus-faced publications, notwithstanding their blustering testimony against some few points of detail in the Romanist system, since they admit the fundamental principles upon which the Popish doctrine and practice are founded, and palliate what cannot be defended, while they reprobate genuine Protestantism, under the nicknames of Zuinglianism, Calvinism, Neology, Rationalism, and Socinianism, to the heart's content of the most bigoted Papist. Mr. Canning admirably described, in his "New Morality," the practical effect of the spurious "candour" with which the Oxford Tracts allow so liberally for what is good in Popery, and admit so beneficently for what is wrong in Protestantism, that black becomes white, and white black.

"Much may be said on both sides. Hark! I hear
A well-known voice that murmurs in my ear,—
The voice of Candour:
Candour, which loves in see-saw strains to tell
Of acting foolishly, but meaning well;*
And finds, with keen discriminating sight,
Black's not *so* black; nor white *so very* white."

---

* Take two or three examples of this out of many in the Oxford Tracts. The important Eleventh Article of the Church of England, on Justification by Faith, has led, say the Tract writers, "to the wildest Antinomianism;" but notwithstanding it was "*innocently intended*." The Reformers acted foolishly, but meant well. Our wretched Articles are described as obscure and lamentably defective; but then, say the Tracts, they ought to be candidly "apologized for." Dr. Pusey argues in his Treatise on Baptism, that their language respecting the sacraments was "a concession" to mongrel Protestantism; a concession as unhappy, as, he says, it was "fruitless;" but then he candidly adds that there was "much temptation" to make it; so that even here our Reformers meant well, though they acted foolishly. The only particular in which they cannot be "apologized for," the Tracts teach, is for omitting "any direct safeguard against disbelief of the doctrine of the apostolical succession." But amends are made for this trifling defect of candour, by being doubly candid to Rome and the Council of Trent. For instance; the Oxford Tract divines do not themselves see their way to the doctrine of purgatory; but then, even in the creed of Pope Pius, which states it most strongly, it is "a great relief" to their minds, they say, that the wording is so "vague," that no man needs leave the church of Rome on account of it. So

We will now quote Mr. Townsend's statement, which is not open to the objection brought against the Layman's, though it equally shews the spirit of the Tract.

"So much of the Breviary of the church of Rome is approved, that we find the prayers to the Virgin Mary to intercede for us, to be mentioned without sufficient reprobation either of its idolatry, or of the innumerable evils which have resulted from the whole doctrine of canonized Saints, and supplications to the Virgin, the Angels, the Apostles, and the Saints to intercede for us, at the throne of God.....The direct worship of Saints and of the Virgin is censured, p. 9 and 23—but it is so mentioned in pages 61, 10 and 11, that I express my opinion very gently when I say the passages in question excited much surprise."

Our correspondent says, that "the Christian Observer adopts the affirmation" of the Layman. This is not correct. We never so much as alluded to it. We said generally of the Layman's book, that it "deserved serious consideration;" and we extracted from its contents two long consecutive passages, amounting to about eighteen close columns, and containing hundreds of statements; but we entered into no detail of the items. There might be various things which we should have expressed differently, or might disapprove of; but if reviewers cannot speak generally of books as deserving consideration, or give quotations from them, without being made answerable for every single remark in them, there is an end to all notice of publications; for to comment on every passage respecting which there may be a difference of opinion, would swell a single review to a volume; besides which, to make one particular exception, instead of leaving the whole passage to the judgment of the reader, would be virtually to guarantee all that is not excepted. We have often wished to introduce, every month, a brief notice of new publications; but we have found by experience, that if there is one doubtful passage in a book recommended, or one good one in a book censured—as must almost invariably be the case—offence is taken as if what is good is disparaged, or what is bad is approved.

However, that our correspondent may see that there was not a shadow of reason for saying that the Christian Observer "adopts the affirmation," that the writers of the Oxford Tracts approve of all that they have copied from the Breviary, we will quote what the Christian Observer has said, again and again, upon the subject. It will be seen that our statements were correct, not merely in substance, but to the very letter; while, at the same time, we shewed the insidiousness of the writers in so artfully balancing their arguments as to insinuate mischief, and yet to provide themselves with a refuge against the charge of direct inculcation. We have alluded to this studied ambiguousness and "reserve in communicating religious knowledge" scores of times. We said only in our last Number (p. 653), in the very review of the Layman's Essays,

---

again, it is quite uncandid in the Layman to insinuate that they are not very harsh against "the invocation of the saints, and the images of Christ and the blessed Virgin;" whereas they have explicitly said, after weighing all the *prso* and *cons*, "It is safest not to pay them this extraordinary honour;" though with admirable candour they do not forget to add that the Tridentine decrees in defence of these idolatrous rites—we beg pardon, this "extraordinary honour"—"possibly admit of an honest interpretation." How could the Layman be so uncandid as to suppose that sufficient zeal of reprobation is not conveyed in the quiet words "safest not"? Could they also speak more earnestly against "transubstantiation," than to say, that "If (if!!) it is to be opposed," it must not be by argument or Scripture, but only by tradition; and that in all our contests with Rome, we had better avoid "subjects more especially sacred," and confine our attention to a few "practical grievances." What would the Layman have, if such explicit declarations will not content him?

in allusion to Mr. Newman's Remarks on Justification: "We protest against this shuffling sort of *pro* and *con* argumentation; why does not Mr. Newman plainly tell us, that sanctification is justification, and that we are justified by our good works?" We had spoken still more strongly—it might be thought uncharitably—at a former page of the same review (p. 651), of "the worse than Jesuitical slyness (we must speak honestly, however offensively) with which the Oxford Tract divines, while affecting to write boldly, couch their worst doctrines in measured and well-sounding terms;" which we proceeded to exemplify in the instance of the tract, No. 80, so ably replied to by Mr. Townsend.

Now let our respected correspondent observe in what manner we spoke of the Oxford Breviary tract the very first time we mentioned it—namely, in our Vol. for 1837, p. 176.

"Laud caused the communion table to be called an 'altar,' which our Book of Common Prayer, much to the regret of certain divines, will not allow; he transferred pictures from the Mass-book to the temple of God, and did not fail to add crucifixes. It remained only for the compilers of the Oxford Tracts to introduce the Papal Breviary among us in a cheap form, as they have done in the English language, for wide circulation, especially, they say, 'for the use of the clergy.' Their reason for this proceeding they state to be, that 'there is so much of excellence and beauty in the services of the Breviary,' that if a Protestant is 'but ordinarily candid and unprejudiced,' he might be so dazzled as to fall into Popery, unless told that much of this excellence and beauty is the common property of the universal church. The refined object, therefore, proposed in circulating these Popish services, is to take from Rome the credit of what is not her own; but the far more obvious bearing of the publication is to abate the alarms of Protestants at much that they are apt to consider Popish, by shewing, that, though unhappily not adopted by the Anglican church, owing to the sad prejudices of the Reformation, it was the property of the church in better days. The spirit of the publication, whatever may be the intention of the editors, is most insidious and anti-Protestant. The 'ignorant' person who is supposed to sit down to the perusal, is expected to rise from it charmed with 'excellence and beauty:' and, of course, reverencing the Church of Rome which has retained it; thanking the Oxford divines who have rescued it; and deeply lamenting that the Church of England should have rejected it. Indeed, but from various untoward circumstances which these tracts mourn over, we might have, the Oxford writers think, much better Offices, Articles, and Homilies, than we possess: in short, exactly such as Laud himself would have fully applauded."

Our correspondent will see, from this extract, that we did not charge the Oxford Tract writers with recommending all that is in the Breviary: but we distinguished between their exoteric and esoteric object. Again, in our paper on "Oxford Tract Saintology" (1837, p. 579, &c.) we said:

"That most exceptionable publication, No. 75 of the Oxford Tracts and Treatises, on the popish Breviary, contains not only an insidiously unfair selection of nearly a hundred pages from its abominable contents [insidiously unfair, because virtually they recommend the Breviary, by leaving out the worst of its abominations, while they give, with faint censure, such a portion of what is exceptionable, as may seem to prove them impartial]: but also a new general service for the commemoration of the Dead (!!!), including Vespers, Matins, Nocturns, and a prayer for their souls! compiled by the Oxford Tract divines.....The writer of this anti-Protestant publication on the Breviary—he suppresses his name—tells us that his object in the services for Bishop Ken and the commemoration of the Dead, is to carry out the principle and spirit of those inestimable forms of devotion which are contained in our authorized Prayer-Book. What a falsification! Our authorized Prayer Book commemorates by name, only the Apostles of our Lord; and them not in human legends, but in the infallible narratives of Holy Writ: whereas the *Service for Bishop Ken's Day* (!!!), March 21, gives legends like those of the Church of Rome, from human story-books, which may chance to be full of errors or absurdities; and actually mixes them among the lessons for the day from Holy Writ, as if there were not the slightest difference in value or authority between them; *just as the old monkish legends are given in the blasphemous Breviary.*"

After quoting a portion of this Oxford legend about Bishop Ken, we added:

"The above is a specimen of this attempt to revive the superstitions of the Popish Breviary in a Protestant country. Not without ample reason did the compilers of the Anglican Prayer-book, in their Preface 'concerning the Service of the Church,' reprobate those Popish 'legends' and 'commemorations' of which the office for Bishop Ken's day is a humble imitation. In the early Christian church, say they, the service was so ordered that 'all the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof, should be read over once every year.....But these many years past, this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories and legends, with multitude of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals, that commonly, when any book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread.' This would be the case under the Oxford Tract system. The Church of England has appointed certain Scriptures to be read upon the twenty-first of March; but the Oxford divines supersede that appointment by one of their own, which they consider more profitable, that is, by a 'commemoration' full of 'stories, legends, responds, verses, and vain repetitions,' giving, for example, uninspired 'lessons' upon Bishop Ken, instead of the lessons of canonical Scripture appointed for the day. Should this small dose of Popery not prove too nauseous to the people of England to forbid a repetition of the experiment, Archbishop Laud's day, we suppose, will follow, and then Sacheverell's, and then perhaps Heylin's; and so on, till we have some two hundred and fifty 'commemorations,' made up in part of modern English saintology, and in part of excerpts from the Popish Breviary, which our church in her Puritanism rejected; till at length these legends will take the place of the inspired lessons prescribed by the Church of England, and bring back our calendar to that intricate confusion and ungodly superstition which characterized it before the Reformation. The Oxford Tract divines wish, they say, to shew 'the excellence and beauty of the Breviary,' and to 'recover what we have but lost through inadvertence.' Lost through inadvertence! They know perfectly well that it was not 'lost through inadvertence,' but rejected with abhorrence."

The mischief which the Oxford Tracts effect by their "stealthiness" is so great, that it ought to be fully exposed. No persons know better than these writers that it is not a few exceptive words, but the general tenour of a composition, which fixes its character. Dr. Pusey has himself well expressed this in his treatise upon Baptism, where he says, (page 94,) "The influence which a man has upon his contemporaries, and upon posterity, depends *entirely* upon his *prominent system of belief*. That which has seized possession of his own mind, is that whereby he influences the minds of others. The more retiring parts of his system, by which it may be to him occasionally modified and controlled, have but little influence upon himself; how should they then have strength enough to reach others?" The learned professor's observations apply forcibly to the Oxford Tracts. When blame is justly attached to them, in regard to their obvious palpable tendency, some overlooked modification, some exceptive words in a corner, are pointed out, and the objector is accused of unfairness, because he considered the strong impression left upon the mind of the reader, rather than a few qualifying expressions, which served rather to cover the retreat of the writer, if forced to abandon his position, than to indicate his direct and undeniable object. If the practical effect of the Tracts be to draw the minds of men nearer to the church of Rome as a "dear sister," and to alienate them from Protestantism; it is not a cold admission that there are some faults in Popery, that can alter the general impression. The writers may tell us that they do not "in the slightest degree approximate to a recommendation of Romanism," seeing that the Romanists require "an *unqualified* assent to *the whole* of the Breviary;" whereas "there are *passages*," they say, "which no Anglican ever could admit." But what avail these reservations of "unqualified," and "the whole," and "passages;" if the general impression intended to be made by nearly 150 close pages of remark and extract is, that the Breviary has been grossly misrepresented

by Protestant writers; that black is not *so* black, nor what Protestants consider Romish, *so very* Romish. What signifies a passing remark that, "graver and sounder matter being excluded," [Scripture to wit!] "apocryphal legends of saints were used to stimulate and occupy the popular mind;" if the writer goes on to shew his own predilection for "apocryphal legends," by adding a new one of Bishop Ken, whom he canonizes upon his own usurped authority, in virtue of his being a non-juror? The incautious reader replies, "Well, after all, these tracts have convinced me that our boasted Reformation has done more harm than good; and that our Homilies are very unjust and uncharitable, when, instead of saying, in modified phrase, that we cannot give our "unqualified assent" to "*the whole*" of the doctrines and services of Rome, they burst out into such unqualified language as the following:—

"To pass over the *ungodly* and *counterfeit* religion, let us rehearse some other kinds of papistical superstitions and abuses, as of beads, of *Lady psalters*, and rosaries, of fifteen Oes, of St. Bernard's verses, of St. Agatha's letters, of purgatory, of masses satisfactory, of stations and jubilees, of feigned relics, of hallowed beads, balls, bread, water, palms, candles, fire, and such other; of superstitious fastings, of fraternities or brotherhoods, of pardons, with such like merchandise; which were so esteemed and abused, to the great prejudice of God's glory and commandments, that they were made most high and most holy things, whereby to attain to the everlasting life, or remission of sins." (Homily on Good Works.)

The venerable reformers who wrote thus *meant something;* and there was no danger of Dr. Wiseman and his fellow Romanists availing themselves of their writings to smooth the way for a return to the church of Rome.

In attributing "stealthiness" to the writers of this school, we are only ascribing what is not very remote from their avowed system of "reserve in communicating religious knowledge;" and indeed stealthiness must of necessity be the characteristic of a sect which has its exoteric and esoteric classes. But the word "stealthiness" was not ours; we have borrowed it from the modern lay father of this very school, the late Mr. Alexander Knox, who is so enamoured of the stealthy system, that he even finds it pervading the Anglican prayer-book. Read, for instance, the following most extraordinary passage in his much lauded "Remains," Vol. I. p. 54.

"The distress of the English Episcopal church, during the Usurpation, had more than ever endeared her to her genuine children; and the hand which inflicted the discipline, served to abate all undue Protestant zeal. A revision, therefore, of the Liturgy being called for, (at the restoration of Charles II.) the revisors seized the opportunity, contrary to what the public was reckoning upon, to make our formularies not more Puritanic but more Catholic. *They effected this without doubt*, STEALTHILY, and to appearance by the minutest alteration; but to compare the communion service, as it now stands, especially its rubrics, with the form in which we find it previous to that transaction, will be to discover, that, *without any changes of features which* COULD CAUSE ALARM, *a new spirit* was then breathed into our communion service; principally by a few significant circumstances in the manner of conducting the business, which were fitted to impress the devout, THOUGH CERTAIN TO BE FULLY UNDERSTOOD ONLY BY THE INITIATED. Who can doubt of this transaction being, in all its bearings, *providential?* (!!!) And yet it was clearly insufficient to produce any extended or striking effect. It has actually *escaped any general observation.* Wheatly, on the Liturgy, notices the changes, but, though himself a high churchman, overlooks their import. Nichols, if I remember right, scarcely adverts to the fact; and Shepherd, who meant to take pains, seems not to have known anything of the matter. What then can we suppose but that these changes *were meant by Providence to subserve ulterior movement;* to be dormant as it were until nearer the time of the end, when it might suit the order of Providence that what was before deposited as seed, should grow up into a rich and luxuriant harvest." "The dread of Popery, and the consequent prejudice against everything vulgarly branded with that stigma, is even more powerful now than when England was alarmed by the prospect of the Spanish match; and among those, who, if an

opening were given, would think themselves solely qualified to amend the Established Church—I mean the persons called Evangelicals—the antipathy rises to rancour. Nothing, therefore, would be less conceivable than that if a revision of the Liturgy were undertaken now, the line pursued, or the result accomplished, would resemble in any respect what was done in 1662."

Mr. Knox's disciples may be assured that if "the Evangelicals," as he calls them, were to undertake a revision of the Liturgy, they would not do it *sneakingly*—we beg pardon, "stealthily,"—but honestly and above board. They abhor the whole system of exotericism and esotericism; slyly altering passages in documents, so that none but "the initiated" suspect the meaning of the changes, till "while men slept" they produce "a rich and luxuriant harvest;" they indignantly cast off from the Anglican prayer-book and its compilers the foul reproach that it was manufactured in this disingenuous and Jesuitical manner; and they reprobate, as profane and blasphemous, the suggestion that the Divine Author of light and truth employed chicane and hypocrisy, to "subserve ulterior movement." This is the first time, we imagine, that "Providence" was made to act "stealthily" in order not "to cause alarm." God is represented as "providentially" overruling, that one of the rubrics, and a word in the prayer for the church militant, should be so "stealthily" altered, that no person but the confederators suspected the real drift; so that our most celebrated ritualists, such as Nichols, and Shepherd, and even Wheatley, notwithstanding he was "a high churchman," did not know that the Church of England has by a side-wind introduced a shew-bread table, and an altar, and an actual commemorative sacrifice; all which she had openly expelled from her service-book, and did not dare to restore except thus stealthily, so as to be discoverable only by "the initiated," till the time came for "ulterior movement." Dr. Pusey being one of these esoterics, of course knows the secret; and the time being ripe for "ulterior movement," he divulges it as follows, in his letter to Mr. Townsend, in reply to the Christian Observer. Speaking of the rubric about placing the bread on "the table"—there is not a word about "altar;" that would have been too barefaced; the innovation was contrived more stealthily—he says:

"This rubric existed in Edward the Sixth's first book; was omitted (among some other very miserable changes) in the second, and was restored after the Savoy conference. Its meaning, too, is historically known, that it was the intention of our church, by inserting it, to restore the primitive custom of *offering the bread and wine upon the altar by the hands of the priest, in commemoration of the one atoning sacrifice upon the cross;* and, to express this in words, they inserted *then*, for the first time, the word 'oblations' after 'alms,' which was the old received name for this kind of offering."

We must not interrupt our statement to discuss the question, whether the word "oblation" was really intended, either stealthily or otherwise, to imply that the bread and wine are to be brought from a table of prothesis to an altar of sacrifice, as in the church of Rome, with a view to convey the notion of the real presence and an actual sacrifice, which the Oxford Tract writers contend for. We have not the slightest belief that it was; and we feel ourselves able to prove, that as "alms" mean the donations to the poor, so oblations mean the donations for the minister (if such are given), and, it may be, also of the bread and wine for the service of the sanctuary, as the Queen gave her various "oblations" at her coronation, but not as victims (so to speak) presented for a sacrifice.

This, however, is not our present subject; we are only defending the revisors of the Prayer-book from the left-handed compliment of having been Jesuits; and of surreptitiously introducing innovations of no apparent moment, and so as not to "cause alarm," but which "the initiated," when matters were

ripe for "ulterior movement," would know how to make good use of. Nor do we accuse Dr. Pusey of casting this Knoxite slur upon the revisors of the Prayer-book; on the contrary, he says that the meaning of the alterations is "historically known," which Mr. Knox's statement most clearly disproves; for even our best ritualists, he shews, had not discovered it; unless indeed by "historically known" Dr. Pusey means by "the initiated," so as to convey after all an idea of "stealthiness;" as if the revisors had said to those who wished for a Laud-like revision, "Be quiet and patient; Protestants will not away with an altar and a sacrifice; with the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the Bellarmine notion of opus operatum sacramental grace; but we will introduce here and there a significant word, or ceremony, which will virtually effect all you wish without causing alarm; and when the danger is forgotten, and a race arises which recollects not the distinctive features of the Reformation, you may ground upon the exoteric words the esoteric meaning; appealing from the text of the book to history as its exponent."

This "stealthiness"—we use the term, because Mr. Knox having employed it to express his notion of the quiet good sense and Christian prudence of the revisors of the Prayer-book, it cannot be said that we adopt a harsh word when we apply it to the conduct of those whose labours he would have rejoiced to witness;—this stealthiness, this esoteric "reserve in communicating religious knowledge;" this studied "imparting words before ideas," which the advertisement to the second volume of the Tracts specifies to be "the peculiarity of all religious teaching," for we are to learn before we understand;—this absence of plain straitforwardness is the very characteristic of the Oxford Tract school. Listen to Mr. Froud, a crotchetty self-conceited young man, but whose testimony upon the present subject is important, as he was one of the Oxford Tract writers, and stood high in the confidence of his colleagues, by one of whom a selection from his papers has been given to the world with high eulogy, expressly with a view to promote Oxford Tract doctrine. The following are brief extracts: we give them merely in proof that there is more of calculating "stealthiness" in the getting up of the Oxford Tracts than most uninitiated persons are aware of; and that we must often judge of the intention rather by their obvious spirit than by nicely balanced words. No discerning man can doubt what is their esoteric meaning, whatever may be their exoteric. In this very matter of the Breviary, the exoteric object is doubtless very good; but let the following extract from Mr. Froud shew what an Oxford Tract author, when writing to his colleague, is pleased to affirm of the Papist service-book. Curiously enough he supposes the very case of "A Layman," and boldly says that the "Breviary" has far greater claims on his deference than the Anglican Prayer-book. We recommend the Layman who writes the "Essays" to take special note of this passage:—

"Why is the opinion of the English clergy, since the enactment of the prayer-book, entitled to be called the teaching of the Church, more than that of the clergy of the sixteen previous centuries? or, again, than the clergy of France, Italy, Spain, Russia, &c. &c.? I can see no other claim which the Prayer-book has on a layman's deference, as the teaching of the Church, which the Breviary and Missal have not in a far greater degree."

The following are short miscellaneous extracts:

"..... —— has sent me your resolutions for our Association, which I think excellent, only I should like to know why you flinch from saying that the power of making the Body and Blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles: it seems to me much simpler, and less open to cavil, than 'continuance and due application of the sacraments.'"

"It has lately come into my head, that the present state of things in England makes an opening for reviving the *monastic system*. I think of putting the view forward under the title of 'Project for reviving Religion in great towns.'"

"I don't know whether I mentioned to you that —— and —— are going to indite verses for the British Magazine, under the title 'Lyra Apostolica.'.... —— would not take a sonnet that I made, because it was too fierce, *but says it may come by and by.*"

"It struck me the other day, that we might be able, out of the embryo ... to get up contributions for a Quarterly Magazine on a very unpretending scale; to be at first only historical and matter of fact. A thing of that sort *might sneak into circulation as a book of antiquarian research, and yet, if well managed, might undermine many prejudices.*"

"As to giving up the Tracts, the notion is odious. Is it *expedient* to put forth any paper on 'the Doctrine necessary to salvation?' *I am led to question whether justification by faith is an integral part of this doctrine.* I have not breathed this to a soul but you, and *express* myself off hand. Is the denial of it anathematised directly or by implication? May one not broadly maintain, that no one has any right to call any opinion necessary, unless he believes its *necessity*, as distinct from its truth, to be revealed (I mean in Scripture or Tradition)? If so, how liberal and how bigoted one may be at the same time without refining! I could be content to waive the Articles, keeping the Creeds, and so forth."

We will quote but one short passage more. Our readers will remember, that we had a controversy with the divines of this school upon various matters of ritual and ceremony; among others, that of kneeling before "the altar" in the ordinary morning and evening service, with their back to the people, like the Popish priests, instead of conforming to the usual place and attitude of the Protestant minister. Some readers thought that we attached too much importance to such alleged trifles; but we knew that they were intended to involve matters of serious moment; for example, that the clergyman kneeling with his back to the people, before "the altar," is an intercessor and a sacrificer, as distinguished from the Protestant notion of a pastor. The exoterics saw nothing of importance in it; but listen to one of the initiated "apostolicals," as the Oxford Tract divines call themselves:—

"I am sure the daily service is a great point; *so is kneeling with your back to the people*, which, by the bye, seems to be striking all apostolicals at once."

We wish we could exempt Dr. Pusey himself from being obnoxious to some charge of stealthiness, in the sense which Mr. Knox meant to be honourable. But we cannot do so; and if any of our readers think this statement uncalled for, or uncharitable, let them, before they condemn us, re-peruse the remarks on his reply to his letter to Mr. Townsend, in our Numbers for last February and March. Take but two or three instances out of many. Mr. Townsend had said, "Some have added to the surplice a peculiar kind of cross." Dr. Pusey, replied, in few words, "No cross has been added to the surplice." Nor had there; for it had only been added to a "stole" worn over the surplice! Mr. Townsend complained of other innovations. Dr. Pusey denied that there had been any in any church in or near Oxford. What! had not Mr. Newman, for example, innovated at Littlemore? No; that was a *new* church. But had he not innovated in an *old* one at Oxford? No, for it was to "a new congregation;" "so careful," said Dr. Pusey, "have these clergy been *not to startle their congregations* by anything *to them* an innovation." The complaint was respecting innovations upon the practices of the church; Dr. Pusey denied the allegation, under the reservation of innovations as regarded some particular building or congregation. Mr. Knox says that the revisors of our Liturgy acted "stealthily," in order not to "cause alarm." Had the Oxford divines this in view when they agreed to be so careful in managing their innovations, as "not to startle their congregations?" Significative customs were to be introduced gradually; the people were not ripe at once for the Breviary and Bishop Ken's Day; but once get

a usage established before men know what it implies, and the "initiated" will turn it to good account in their "ulterior movement."

The stealthiness of Mr. Newman we have so often exposed, that we need not repeat the task. When pressed by our references to the Thirty-nine Articles, he was constrained to say: "The Christian Observer may rest satisfied that Dr. Pusey's friends will never assert that the Articles have any particular meaning at all." His most willing readers confess themselves so perplexed with his vagueness and apparent contradictions that they are at a loss to know what he means. Indeed no man can clearly understand the Oxford Tract writers in reference to Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the church, penance, mortal and venial sin, praying for the departed, justification, the work of Christ, the work of the Holy Spirit, and many other topics, without remembering their own doctrine of "reserve," and the remark of Mr. Froud's critic, that what is "too fierce" at first may come in afterwards. We have no particular reason to praise Mr. Newman's candour. He wrote to us to know if we would insert his letters. We answered at once, Yes. He complained, however, that we added notes to them; but this was necessary for ourselves, for our readers, and for truth; otherwise opinions which we believed to be wrong, and charges which we knew to be unfounded, would go forth without refutation. We also (1837, p. 247), in reply to his not very reasonable demand, that we should insert his letter, "without one word of our own," asked "Why should he wish this, *unless he intends to reprint it separately, without being required in candour to admit that some sort of reply had been given to it?*" That reply not a few readers thought perfectly, we may say triumphantly, satisfactory; and we had numerous applications to reprint it; some of the applicants offering to defray all charges. But we declined doing so. Mr. Newman has, however, reprinted his letter in the Oxford Tracts without the slightest notification that any reply had been given to it; so that, whereas we fairly laid his remarks and our reply side by side, he has not had the candour to own that any reply whatever had been proffered; and, as if to prevent an inquiring reader from having any clue to our refutation, he has kept back the name of the Magazine in which it appeared. He has also altered and dressed up his letter, so that under the pretext of candour he has made matters worse. He has also added, as a reason why he did not write again to the Magazine, that it had not complied with his challenge to shew in what respects Dr. Pusey contravened the Articles of the Church of England. We had shewn this to satiety; and are willing to repeat the exhibition; so that the apology is but "stealthiness."

To expose in full the stealthiness of these publications would require volumes. They ought to be closely tracked in their quotations and references, as well as their statements and reasonings. We are not the only critics who have discovered this; take the following illustration, from the Dublin Christian Examiner, of the operation of the system of foisting in a convenient word, and of "reserve" in communicating what may "startle" a reader, and "cause alarm." The hook must not be felt till the landing-net is ready.

"We are sorry, we say it unaffectedly, to be obliged to notice two instances of what we can scarcely help calling rather discreditable management in the writer of Tract 34. In the third section of Tertullian's book De Corona Militis, occur these words—'Hanc [observationem] si nulla Scriptura determinavit, certè consuetudo corroboravit, quæ sine dubio de *traditione* manavit. Quomodo enim usurpari quid potest, si traditum prius non est? Etiam in traditionis obtentu exigenda est, inquis, auctoritas scripta. Ergo quæramus an et *traditio* non Scripta non debeat recipi,' &c. &c. To this authority the writer of the Tract in question appeals; how reasonably we do not now inquire; though we may remind the reader of Hooker's judgment, that the book was written in a

passion, and that, 'as men's speeches uttered in heat of distempered affection, have oftentimes much more eagerness than weight, so he that shall mark the proofs alleged and the answers to things objected in that book, will now and then espy the like imbecility.'—E. P. Book ii. ch. v. 7. But, whether the authority were good or bad, its sense (or nonsense) ought surely to have been given fairly. Now the writer of this Tract does not give the Latin (though the Tract is addressed *ad scholas*), but, instead of it, supplies us with the following more convenient translation. 'Though this observance has not been determined by any text of Scripture, yet it is established by custom, which doubtless is derived from Apostolic tradition.' And, again—'Let us examine then, how far it is true, that an Apostolic tradition itself, unless it is written in Scripture, is inadmissible.'

"The reader sees here that the word Apostolic is twice interpolated without any sort of warrant from the original, and how grossly unfair this repeated interpolation is, will appear from the fact that, in the immediate context, Tertullian himself lays it down, 'that every rule binds that is accordant with right reason, by whomsoever introduced;' and, '*omni fideli* licere concipere et constituere, duntaxat quod Deo congruat, quod disciplinæ conducat, quod saluti proficiat;' and that, of these very traditions here mentioned, he alleges not only the confirmation of custom, but the patronage of reason, and that he illustrates his position by the example of a custom, which bound the faithful before it was sanctioned by the Apostolic decision. The case, in fact, is so plain, that Rigaltius, in his note, admits that Tertullian is not speaking of Apostolic traditions, and the reader, if he wishes for further satisfaction upon the subject, will find the same point excellently proved by the great Daille in his very learned discourse *de Cultibus Lat. Rel.* p. 53. But, indeed, the following passage (on which our eye has just happened to glance, in examining the next section to that quoted in the Tracts), seems alone sufficient to decide the matter. 'Hanc (rationem) nunc expostula, salvo traditionis respectu, *quocunque traditore censetur*.' The quotation in the Tracts stops short but a few lines above these words.

"Again, amongst other articles of his traditionary ware, Tertullian enumerates oblations for the dead, holding it impious to fast or pray kneeling upon a Sunday, or from Easter to Whitsuntide, and taking it to heart if any bread and drink, even at common meals, fell upon the ground. These, it is obvious, were of rather too advanced a nature, to be quite palatable to his readers yet, and the writer accordingly with great prudence omits them."

We will now give our readers another notable and very recent illustration of this systematic stealthiness. Under the cover of our last Number will be found an advertisement of a projected publication, entitled "Tracts of the Anglican Fathers." Part I. is said, in the announcement, to contain "Cranmer's Four Sermons; viz.—1. Holy Baptism.—2. The Apostolical Succession and the Power of the Keys.—3. The Communion of the Lord's Supper.—4. The Gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Holy Catholic Church: with an Introductory Preface." Each of these Tracts is dated on a red letter-day: to wit—No. 1. "Oxford; the Feast of St. James;" with an advertisement, "Cambridge; the Feast of the Resurrection."—No. 2. "Oxford; the Feast of St. Mark."—No. 3. "Oxford; the Feast of the Holy Trinity" [Trinity Sunday! !]—No. 4. "Cambridge; the Feast of St. Peter the Apostle."

We need not inform our readers that Cranmer's Sermons are not thus red-lettered; and in truth this dating in the case in question is mere affectation; for neither is there any thing in the discourses that has reference to the days respectively assumed; nor is the year of our Lord given, so that the red-letter notification is of no service for the usual purposes of a date. It is therefore mere foppery; it means nothing. The bonâ fide date of "Christmas-Day," affixed to a sermon on the Nativity, would be appropriate; and to say Michaelmas-Day, in such and such a year, would be specific as a reference; but to protrude what neither serves for a date nor applies to the text, and what only states that the writer happened to be writing on such a red-letter day, when any other day would do quite as well, is but foppish egotism. Nay, it is too probably downright falsification; for will any man believe that the various

writers who have put forth innumerable books, tracts, papers, and letters, thus ecclesiastically dated, all happened bonâ fide to find themselves writing the date on some red-letter day. We offer the following problem to the writer who is pleased to date as above from Cambridge. A year contains 365 days; and the English Prayer-book enumerates 27 feasts; exclusive of Sundays: compute the probability, that in the case of a given number of tracts, letters, and other papers in magazines, and so forth, say 50 or 100, the writers should all have casually found, that every one of the days on which they happened to be writing their dates was one of those twenty-seven days. It is 338 to 27 (that is, more than 12 to 1) that it did not so happen in any one given instance; it is therefore more than 144 to 1 that it did not so happen in two given instances; more than 1728 to 1 that it did not so happen in three given instances; 20,736 in 4; and so on to the fiftieth or hundredth power of 12; which soon involves an improbability so great that no effort of the human mind can grasp its magnitude. To say that it is trillions, of trillions, of trillions to one, that the dates thus systematically assigned are fabricated—that is, are not the real dates upon which the respective authors were actually, though casually, writing—would be to speak immeasurably within the enormous mass of figures involved in the question. All the oaths which were ever taken would not induce any Cambridge wrangler, or senior-optime, to believe a circumstance so all but impossible. The dates therefore are not—cannot be—the real dates on which the authors were casually writing; they are therefore falsified dates for mere effect; and instead of bringing our Anglican red letter days into more respectful notice, or ordinary use, such foppery only exposes them to ridicule. It is worse than child's play to give dates which are not, which cannot be, the bonâ fide casual dates. There is but one Saint's-day in July; it is therefore 30 to 1 that the writer who dates his preface St. James's-day, even if he wrote in July, did not happen casually to be dating his labours on that very day; if therefore dates are intended to mean what they purport, he falsifies; if not, he trifles.

But we also are trifling to dwell on the matter, for it was not to this fabricated dating that we applied the appellation of stealthiness. Let us go back to what are called "Cranmer's four sermons." Now they are not Cranmer's sermons, and they are very properly refused a place in his collected works in the Clarendon Press edition. The Editor of the "Anglican Fathers" is obliged to admit this in his general preface to Part I.; but he had given no such notification in the separate sermons published as tracts; nay, he expressly calls them Cranmer's; he says, for instance, "See Cranmer's Sermon of Baptism;" and they are stated to be Cranmer's five times in the advertisement. They are taken from the "Catechismus" published in 1548; and were a translation from a work in Latin by Luther's friend Justus Jonas, though set forth by the authority of Cranmer. The distinction is of some importance; but we do not here dwell upon it; as neither was this our charge of stealthiness.

What then was it? On referring to the aforesaid four sermons of Cranmer, in the "Tracts of the Anglican Fathers," we read their several title pages as follows: No. 1, "Holy Baptism; a sermon set forth by the most Rev. Father in God, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop and Martyr; reprinted from his [it was *not* his] Catechismus of 1548." No. 2, "The Apostolical Succession and the Power of the Keys, a sermon," &c. (as before.) No. 3, "The blessed Sacrament of the Altar, a sermon," &c. (as before.) No. 4, "The Gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Holy Catholic Church, a sermon," &c. (as before.) Now our readers know the extreme displeasure of the Oxford Tract divines at there being nothing about the "Apostolical succession" in our articles; and that the validity

of the orders of foreign Protestants has ever been acknowledged by our Church, and in the writings of her divines; a few Laudites only excepted. But here we have presented to us a sermon of Cranmer's, with this ambiguous expression, "Apostolical succession," on its very front. Again, the Oxford Tract divines mourn bitterly that there is nothing about "the altar," or "the blessed sacrament of the altar"—that incorrigibly popish phrase—in our prayer-book; that the alleged "altar" is studiously called by our reformers, "a table," and the alleged "sacrifice," a "supper." Yet here we have Cranmer, at the very time when he had been composing Protestant Homilies, and was setting forth a Protestant prayer-book, giving to a catechetical sermon for children, and for adults scarcely reclaimed from popery, a title which could not but recall and embody the old associations of transubstantiation and a sacrifice. Well! we thought, the divines of the Oxford Tract persuasion have at last "made a point," by producing, from Cranmer's own title page of his Catechism, what he studiously refrained from saying in the prayer-book; adding (see the preface of the Editor of the "Anglican Fathers") that we ought to judge of what we find in the Prayer-book by what was elsewhere officially put forth by those who compiled it. Thus the argument seemed indissolubly dove-tailed.

But having learned from Mr. Knox that stealthiness is a weapon which his school consider lawful, and even sacred, it occurred to us to look at the matter a little further. And first, in examining the sermons themselves, as reprinted, we neither found the ambiguous and easily perverted expression "Apostolical succession," (for it has a true and sound meaning, as well as one popish and unwarranted by Scripture) nor the ominous phrase "the blessed sacrament of the altar," or anything resembling it. The sermon upon the authority of the keys—that is, of the exercise of godly discipline—speaks in the same general terms of the ministerial office, as the Homilies and the Thirty-nine Articles; there is nothing in its wording offensive to foreign Protestants—how could there be, when it was written, not by Cranmer, (as is falsely stated) but by Jonas, one of themselves? Again, the sermon on the holy communion has no such expression in it as "the blessed sacrament of the altar;" it calls the eucharist "the communion of the Lord's Supper;" so that there is nothing in the text to warrant the title page; and we well know that it was Cranmer himself who caused an edict to be issued to destroy "altars," and to substitute for them "tables."

We confess that we did think it somewhat uncharitable to suspect any treachery in this reprint; for though the original Cathechismus of 1648 is so scarce as very rarely to be met with, and is not to be found in the Clarendon Press edition of Cranmer's works, so that there was not much danger of collation and detection, yet we did think we might trust that in what professed to be a verbatim reprint, with all the affected solemnity of Oxford and Saints days prefixed to each sermon, there would be no unfair dealing. Still it seemed right to refer to a copy of the work; and to seek out the identical edition professed to be printed from. We have done so; and will it be credited that all the words which perplexed us are the forgery of the Oxford and Cambridge editors of the Anglican Tracts; there is not one syllable of them in the book from which they printed. The sermon entitled, in their edition, "Holy Baptism," is "A Sermon of Baptism;" the Sermon on "The apostolical succession, and the power of the keys," is simply and solely "A sermon of the authority of the keys;" the sermon on "The blessed sacrament of the altar," is only "A sermon of the communion of the Lord's Supper;" and the sermon entitled "The gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Holy Catholic Church," is "A sermon of our sanctification." We have examined the titles, the running titles, and the table of contents; and there is not one syllable

of the words above noticed. They are the fraudulent interpolation of these Oxford and Cambridge anonymous re-modellers of the Church of England. We never heard of a more disingenuous trick of unscrupulous controversialism. And yet these very titles are being quoted and requoted as the identical words of Cranmer.

We have neither time nor space to go on with this prolific subject of "Stealthiness;" otherwise we should be glad to spend some pages in examining the new translations of the primitive Fathers, which are in a course of publication by Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey. All that we will say at present is, that they are neither given consecutively, nor in the way of a fair average specimen: nor, from the specimens which we have seen, do we think them impartially edited or translated. As to their design, we will only remark that too many of the writings of the Fathers will be most reverenced where they are least known. But let them be what they may, we deprecate the idea of hearsay or human writing being the guide of faith. We venerate what was excellent in those faithful confessors and martyrs; they loved their Lord; they lived to his glory on earth, and they now live in his blessed presence in heaven; but they were but men like ourselves, and we are only to follow them in proportion as they followed Christ.

We conclude, where we commenced, with expressing our abhorrence of esotericism, and stealthiness, and arcana disciplinæ, and disciplina arcani, and popish "reserve in communicating religious knowledge." With indignation exclaimed bishop Horsley, "Never will I admit that our religion has in it any secret doctrine, from the hearing of which the illiterate laity are to be excluded. The notion of the incompetence of the common people to understand *the whole of* the revealed doctrines..... *is false and abominable*. It is the very principle upon which the sacred text was for so many ages kept under the lock and key of the dead languages." To be sure it is; and the Papists would keep it there still if they could, as witness the following passage in a recent mandate of the Archbishop of Toulouse. He is enforcing the duty of "believing what the pastors teach," because they have received authority from God as the successors of the Apostles, and are the transmittors of tradition; from which he goes on to shew "the duty of reserve in communicating religious knowledge," in the following strain:

"The Catholic Church imitates the reserve of the great Apostle and of the Son of God. [The Oxford Tract's own argument.] Her desire is to confine the permission of reading the Scriptures to those who are disposed to read them with fruit; and to labour to make those disposed who are not so. This is not the conduct of the Separatists. We see them imprudently distributing Bibles throughout the whole earth, casting them with profusion upon the shores of nations that are enemies to the name of Christian, and thus exposing the sacred Scriptures to the attacks of infidels."

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

SHAKESPEARE opens his Henry V. with the following dialogue between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely:

"*Cant.*—My Lord, I'll tell you, that
some Bill is urged,
Which, in the eleventh year of the late
king's reign,
Was like, and had indeed against us
passed,
But that the scambling and unquiet
time
Did push it out of further question.
Ely.—But how, my Lord, shall we
resist it now?
Cant.—IT MUST BE THOUGHT ON.
If it pass against us
We lose the better half of our possessions:
For all the temporal lands which men
devout
By testament have given to the church
Would they strip from us..Thus runs
the Bill.

Ely.—This would drink deep.
Cant.—'Twould drink the cup and all.
Ely.—But what prevention?
Cant.—The king is full of grace and fair regard.
Ely.—And a true lover of the holy church.
..... But, my good Lord,
How now for mitigation of this Bill
Urged by the Commons? Doth his majesty
Incline to it or no?"

We have not quoted this dialogue as illustrative of the condition of the Protestant Anglican church; for instead of being bloated with the wealth which either "men devout," or men under the alarms of superstition, gave to the Romish priesthood, its curtailed revenues, if agrarianised, would not furnish a competent support for its present number of clergy, to supply the spiritual necessities of the "old inhabitants" of England, much less meet the overwhelming demands of our densely-populated new districts; and its prelates, instead of sitting in council to augment their own particular revenues, are making large personal sacrifices for the general religious benefit of the community. Neither have we quoted it in order to raise the Bishop of Ely's question as to the personal inclinations of our beloved and amiable sovereign, so "full of grace and fair regard;" and who, we fervently hope, will in every exigency prove herself indeed "a lover of the holy church," as many of her predecessors have conscientiously done; and regarding whom we would trust that the only cause of anxiety is, lest being, from her tender years, her dependent sex, and the necessities of her station, obliged to see through the eyes of others, and to hear through their ears; to learn as much as those around her think fit to communicate, and with such colouring as they may find it convenient to impart; she may, with the best possible intentions, be led into error in regard to various questions of political policy or religious duty.

But we have given the extract for the sake of the lesson of wisdom contained in the Archbishop's suggestion, "IT MUST BE THOUGHT ON NOW." Not only in "the late king's reign," but also during that of our present beloved Queen, have various "Bills" been "urged by the Commons," which required much "mitigation;" including some which would not merely alienate, or as it is quietly called "appropriate," the "possessions" of the church to secular objects, but drink deeper still, drink "cup and all," by eventually abolishing the church itself as a national communion; and some of which were "like to have passed," had not the balanced play of parties rather than sound religious principle, "the scambling and unquiet time" rather than a fixed course of well-judged policy, "pushed them," for the moment, "out of further question."

But the crisis is not over; the last sighings of the storm have not passed away; there are yet hovering in the air not a few dark clouds, some of which, though, in the expressive phraseology of holy writ, only like a man's hand, may enlarge and accumulate, till they burst, and overwhelm our most cherished institutions in one wide ruin. The political atmosphere is indeed tolerably calm at present; some excellent measures have been adopted, and more bad ones staved off; the moral influence of the country is strong; the rooted attachment of the nation to its constitution in Church and State has been evinced in the most unquestionable manner; the electoral registrations prove the increased and increasing strength of conservative principles; universal suffrage has not yet given to physical masses an absolute domination over mind, morals, and property; our most sacred institutions are not yet exposed to the irresponsible caprice of a ballot; the Dissenters have been repulsed in their attempt, in conjunction with papists, radicals, and infidels, to abolish church-rates, as a prelude to denationalising the Church itself; tithes in England are being commuted under a reasonably fair, though by no means favourable, scheme of adjustment, instead of being wiped out with a sponge; and in Ireland they have been converted into a rent-charge upon a plan which we ought, we suppose, to be nearly satisfied with, since the Primate eulogises it, and Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Crawford denounce it; municipal corporations have not been given to Ireland, according to the schemes proposed by Mr. O'Connell for making them hotbeds of political and ecclesiastical agitation, to the subverting of the Protestant Church Establishment, and possibly the repeal of the union between the two islands; and, not to mention other negatives, the Central Education philosophists have not yet subjected the rising generation, and generations yet unborn, to a system of infidel training; nor have Lord Brougham and the Evangelical Dissenters succeeded in their modified scheme of dissociating it, by legislative enactment, from all connection with the National Church, as if the faith which is fit for adults were not fit for children.

We are thankful for these and similar temporary negatives; but we must not rest in them, or lull ourselves in false security, just because, though the mountain torrent is ever and anon rushing down, we did not happen to be drowned yesterday.

"How, my lord, shall we resist it *now?*

"It must be thought on."

Our fear is, that it is *not* being sufficiently "thought on." We do not believe that either our conservative statesmen, or our right reverend prelates, have fully determined upon any well-defined, boldly decisive course of action. They stand upon the defensive, to be pecked, and mocked, and carped at; but when do they make a bold front and attack the common enemy? when do they take the initiative? when do they more than palliate and ward off some impending blow, and then shout out victory? which means only that we have not been conquered; that we still live, till our enemies shall condescend again to attack us.

Is this wise or high-principled? Ought we not rather to adopt a decisive course of action? A bold policy would be the safest policy. Are we threatened with having our churches destroyed, and, as the first step towards it, with having church-rates cut from under us? Let some statesman of high character and ability bring in a bill for encouraging the building and endowing of new churches in populous places. Is the Legislature pestered with proposals for enacting a system of godless education? or of some modified scheme, which, though it virtually involves the principle of a national religion, as does even the recognition of the Bible as a Divine book, and is therefore as unpalatable to Jews, Papists, infidels, and all classes of Nothingarians, as church-rates themselves; still, from its radical deficiencies and dubious enactments, fails to secure the suffrages of the members of the Established Church? Let some mighty mind, equal to the task, excogitate, and earnestly press upon Parliament and the country, a Bill for national education on sound yet moderate and fairly conciliating principles; a bill which must approve itself to all who think it the duty of the legislature to provide for the Christian training of all classes of the people. And so of other cases, in which, while uncertainty exists, agitation will be kept up. We say not that such wise and honest measures would be at once adopted either by Lords or Commons; they might or might not: but the very propounding of them would tend to generate a loftier tone of moral feeling; good timid men would be encouraged, when they found that there are those who will stand up for high principles in high places: that not only is truth defended, but error assailed; the sound part of the nation would rally round so noble a standard; and even if the battle were lost, truth, duty, consistency, and the blessing of God would remain. Men are ever exclaiming, "There is a lion in the way." To be sure there is, or may be, and we should strive to chase or overcome him; not by our pusillanimity to convert every shadow into one. We are not to tremble, but to pray; and not only to pray, but to strive. It was said to Moses by Jehovah, "Why criest thou unto me? Speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward."

It is often asked, Has the Church of England that strength which arises from its being the church of the people, as well as being legislatively established. We sincerely believe that it has; that never since the days of the Reformation has it been more beloved or more useful; and that if it can survive the faults of its friends, it has nothing to fear from the attacks of its enemies. Bishop Berkeley, in a sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, said, that many good men feared that "Popery and infidelity" had made such alarming progress, that one or both would speedily prevail, and blot out Protestantism and the Church of England together. More than a hundred years have since elapsed, and Popery and infidelity are still rife, and their machinations are strengthened by new and strange allies; yet the Church of England still survives: "she is lengthening her cords, and strengthening her stakes;" and this not by new accessions of legislative aid, but rather in the face of discouragements, by the increased piety and zeal of her clergy: for when God would make his people joyful, he clothes his priests with righteousness.

We may refer, as an illustration of these remarks, to the outburst of public displeasure—in which several of the newspapers, secular and morally apathetic as they usually are, have zealously joined—against the bishops of Durham and Norwich, for having subscribed to a volume of sermons, by Mr. Turner, an Arian or Socinian teacher. We do not give the Times newspaper credit for any superfluity of religious feeling; but so much the more does its vehement earnestness on this occasion shew what its conductors know to be the state of public sentiment among the great body of the clergy

and members of the Church of England. Contrast this with the cold indifference which was exhibited, some sixty years ago, in the matter of the Feathers Tavern petition. Amidst all the schemes of liturgical reform (so called) broached during the last seven years, we do not recollect a single instance of any body, either of clergymen or lay-members of our church, asking for alterations of a heterodox character. But what was the character of the changes so eagerly urged by the author of "The Confessional;" with Dr. Jebb, and other clergymen and laymen, professing themselves to belong to the Church of England? for, alas! there were not fewer than two hundred and fifty clergymen who were members of the Feathers Tavern Association. It was avowedly to Arianise or Socinianise the Prayer-book, in order to fit it to the "rational" notions of modern times. But this, it may be said, was the perverted taste of a comparatively small number of individuals. Be it so; but how was it met by the mass of the nation? Was there an outburst of public feeling such as has been exhibited in the recent matter above alluded to? What said Parliament to a petition from 250 clergymen to Socinianise the Prayer-book? Let Robert Hall describe the facts, lest it should be said that we mistate them.

"There was not one member who expressed his belief in the Articles; and Mr. Hans Stanley opposed the bringing up of the petition, as tending to disturb the peace of the country. Of the state of the public mind in the metropolis, we have a striking picture, in a letter from John Lee, afterwards Solicitor-General—'It will surprise you who live in the country,' says he, 'and consequently have not been informed of the discoveries of the metropolis, that the Christian religion is not thought to be an object worthy of the least regard! and that it is not only the most prudent, but the most virtuous and benevolent thing in the world, to divert men's minds from such frivolous subjects, with all the dexterity that can be. This is no exaggeration, I assure you; on the contrary, it seems to be the opinion of nine-tenths of both Houses of Parliament.' The fact is, that through the secularity and irreligion of the clergy, evangelical truth was nearly effaced from the minds of the members of the Establishment in the higher ranks; that an indolent acquiescence in established formularies had succeeded to the ardour with which the great principles of religion were embraced at the Reformation. Such was the state of the public mind, that, in a contest between orthodoxy and heresy, the former proved triumphant, merely because it was already established; and had the plea of antiquity and prescription in its favour."

We thank God that such is not the state of shings now; there is spread throughout the mass of the community, chiefly by the zealous labours of vast numbers of faithful clergymen, so much scriptural knowledge, and, by the Divine blessing, so much true piety, that not from mere prescription, but from knowledge and sound principle, our orthodox Prayer-book, and our apostolical church, are adhered to and upheld with a warmth and ardour which, amidst all our sins and strifes and follies, augur well for the best interests of our beloved country.

From these general remarks we turn to fill up our remaining space with some miscellaneous notices of the month.

The intelligence from the West Indies is, for the most part, highly favourable, as respects the orderly conduct of the emancipated population. It is indeed alleged, that in some places they are reluctant to work. Now even if this were true, it would not be very extraordinary, considering that labour has been hitherto not only a synonyme for exhausting depopulating toil, but a badge of slavery; and that, in escaping from the latter, they might easily fancy they should avoid some considerable portion of the former. But, so far from its being true, they have gone cheerfully to their tasks, wherever a fair remuneration has been offered; and there is not the slightest reason to suspect that the plantations will not be adequately cultivated, if the planters will study either what is just to their labourers, or ultimately to their own advantage. We lament, however, to observe strong symptoms of the continuance of that harsh spirit which has so long characterised their proceedings, and which will require the coercing hand of the British legislature to repress, if freedom is to be more than a parchment boon. It was, we fear, from no liberal or disinterested feeling that some of the local legislators happily anticipated the legal expiration of slavery; but chiefly because the oppression of the apprentices had evoked an overwhelming torrent of indignation in the mother country, and an act had been passed to force them to give fair scope to the abolition measure; sooner than comply with which, they thought it more prudent at once to abolish the apprenticeship, and thus to free themselves from the difficulties in which they were

likely to be involved both with their irritated apprentices, and the imperial legislature. The abolitionists did not finish their task when they gave legal freedom to the bondmen, and twenty millions of money to their masters; they must anxiously watch over the rights and privileges of the former, and, above all, use every effort that the emancipated slave may become "Christ's freeman." The schools and missions are highly prosperous; but much more remains to be effected. If the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society could immediately send out a hundred missionaries, they would be absorbed, and yet numerous estates continue destitute of adequate spiritual instruction. Surely this ought to be promptly "thought on" and remedied.

Lord Durham has relinquished his post in Canada, in consequence of the proceedings in the British parliament respecting his measures. We cannot see that he has much cause to blame her Majesty's ministers, except upon the corrupt political maxim, that you ought always to go with your party right or wrong. Lord Durham had acted illegally; his intention was good, and the measure might be good, but he had overstepped the limits of the statute book. Lord Brougham in no kind spirit brought in a bill of indemnity; the indemnity was needed, whatever were his Lordship's private feelings in urging it; and the conservatives supported his measure, and Lord Melbourne and Lord Glenelg had no option but either to concur in it, or to uphold Lord Durham in what he had done, which was impossible. We cannot say that we participate in all the disappointment which has been expressed in some quarters at the breaking up of Lord Durham's mission. The spirit of that mission bore no friendly aspect towards the salutary influence of England in the Canadas; and it was a grievous "discouragement" to the Protestant Episcopal Church. When we recollect that her Majesty was advised to send out a commission to inquire into the state of education in Canada, with a view to establish such a system "as may conduce to the diffusion of knowledge, religion, and virtue;" and that this commission would be under the control of Lord Durham, who had chosen for his agents, in promoting "religion and virtue," Mr. Wakefield and Mr. Turton, we think the failure less alarming than would have been the success of this ill-omened embassy.

Agitation is strenuously at work in Ireland to overturn the new Tithe bill, that is, to plunder the church in a more flagrant and barefaced manner, than has ever yet been proposed, of her revenues: and some of the protestant landlords are base enough, for their own selfish purposes, to aid the confederacy. We are glad that the mask has been thrown off: and that the question is at length exhibited in the undisguised shape, whether the legislature and people of Great Britain will consent to become a banditti of robbers. We dare to anticipate that this new atrocity will unite all honest men to resist a course of proceeding which must involve in its results the abolition of rents and all other legal claims, and shake the basis of every species of property.

The Irish conciliation and peacemaking Education scheme continues as usual to excite warfare. The Popish Archbishop of Tuam is denouncing it as zealously as the Protestant bishops and clergy. It is, he says, a plan to make "the court of St. James's supersede the Vatican." It embodies, he says, the anti-catholic principle of giving the parents of the children a right to let them read the word of God, or whatever they think fit, instead of recognizing the right of their pastors to judge authoritatively for them. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, one of the leading Commissioners, in replying to these charges, makes a remark which ought to be carefully weighed by all Protestant defenders of this mongrel scheme. He says, that "The pastors in whom the ever-faithful Catholic people confide for the religious instruction of their children, have unrestricted liberty to explain to them, and to impress upon their minds, *even within the walls of the national schools, every article of our faith, and every principle that should regulate our moral conduct.*" We would in all candour ask the Bishop of Norwich, the Hon. and Rev. B. Noel, or any other Anglican who has written in favour of the scheme, whether he is aware that the Popish priesthood have "unrestricted liberty" to inculcate the Romish dogmas on purgatory, transubstantiation, the confessional, penance, justification by human merit, and every other article of Romanish faith and practice, "within the walls of the national schools," supported by Protestant money.

The act for limiting the power of arresting and incarcerating Debtors has come into operation. We see no reason to fear that it will be productive of injury; on the contrary we think

it a measure as wise and beneficial as it is humane. Nothing is gained by imprisoning an honest debtor; and as for those who are fraudulent, the act deals with them as such. The power of keeping a debtor in prison ought on every account to be in the hands of judicial authority, and not of the the creditor. We rejoice also at those reforms in our criminal laws, which have taken place during the last few years, and which are very considerable and important. Before the death of the late King several alterations had been made; and since the accession of our beloved Queen numerous acts have been passed, which embrace a large portion of the criminal code. Every well-judging man must be thankful that the punishment of death for forgery has been repealed. It is fearful to think of the thousands of persons who have been precipitated into eternity for this crime, especially during the time when small Bank of England notes were the only currency for gold. The offence of forgery is so alarmingly dangerous to individuals and society, that scarcely any punishment, which it becomes a humane and Christian nation to inflict, is too great for it, at least under aggravated circumstances; for, morally speaking, an impostor's daily begging letters, or Adey's swindling circulars, may involve greater turpitude, than many a single forgery (committed perhaps under circumstances of strong excitement), for which the criminal has suffered the penalty of death. Yet so serious and dangerous is the offence, that the crown itself felt precluded by certain Draconic dicta—for we will not do the people of England the injustice to say by public opinion — from remitting the awful award; and the consequence was, that innumerable forgeries were committed with impunity, the injured parties preferring to suffer wrong rather than to be the instruments of precipitating an offending fellow-creature into eternity. We have not the slightest fear that the repeal of the capital punishment will increase the offence; or that crime will be encouraged by another humane act—the first to which our beloved monarch affixed her youthful signature—by which, though the penalty of death is not altogether taken away in aggravated cases of personal violence, such as stabbing and shooting; yet where the injury proves slight, transportation or imprisonment is substituted for it. The same substitution is made in late enactments in the case of various other offences We were glad also to find it enacted, that solitary confinement shall not be inflicted for more than one month at a time, or for more than three months in one year. We believe that there is no process so effectual for reclaiming abandoned profligates, or bringing a thoughtless man to consideration, as silence and solitude, wisely and calmly inflicted, and broken by kind advice and Christian instruction; but it may be converted into an instrument of inhuman torture, so as even to deprive the unhappy victim of reason, and to induce permanent idiotcy. One express object of all these ameliorations is to induce persons to prosecute offenders; and we trust and believe that, both in this respect, and as regards the offenders themselves and the repression of crime, the effect has been, and will be, salutary; and we regret to find some of the country magistracy continuing to express a contrary opinion. We hope even to see these mitigations carried still further; and that our criminal laws will be divested of every trace of revenge, ferocity, and unnecessary infliction; so that the evil-doer may find that he has no prospect of escape from merited punishment, by the reluctance of judges, juries, or individuals, to bring his crime home to him, and no mitigation of it in public sympathy.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

ALFRED; Ακουστης; A. Z.; CIVIS; E. M. S.; F. M. S.; MILES; L.; M. λ. ν.; J. D.; A. O.; W. S. C.; B. K.; N. W.; A CONSTANT READER; C. L.; CLERICUS DUNELMENSIS; J, S.; are under consideration.

CANDIDUS AND ECCLESIASTICUS, will perceive that another correspondent has directed our attention to the "Layman's" statement.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

NEW SERIES. } No. 12. DECEMBER. [1838.

RELIGIOUS & MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

"THE HEARER ONLY, AND THE DOER OF THE WORD."

ST. JAMES I. 22—24.

For the Christian Observer.

HIGH as the Gospel rises above every human system of morals and religion, both as to the mysteries it reveals and the precepts it inculcates, yet there is no point in which it more transcends them, than in its energy and practical tendency. The one, cold and heartless, complicated and inoperative, speculations: the other, like the God whom it reveals, simple and efficient, full of quickening and Divine energy, the wisdom of God, and the power of God, unto salvation.

It is true, that the Gospel has added to the moral law a new commandment: that it has revealed the *principle* of all moral obligation and moral obedience; and condensed the whole moral law into one word, namely this, "Thou shalt *love* thy neighbour as thyself." It is true, that the Gospel commences its moral code where human systems stopt short, and teaches as its first lesson in the school of Christ, and as introductory to its kingdom of heaven, a grace for which philosophy did not furnish even a name—humility. "Blessed," says our Divine Teacher, "are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." And let us remember, that in adding to the moral law those two graces, humility and charity, the Gospel has laid the solid foundation, and placed the top stone of pure and genuine morality. It is true, also, that the Gospel has supplied the great want of philosophy, by embodying virtue, and making God manifest in the flesh: that it has brought to light life and immortality: that it has authoritatively proclamed a Saviour and a resurrection; yet in all these truths, great and glorious as they are, the Gospel does not so far transcend every human system, as it does in that profound wisdom, by which it has contrived to interweave its sublimest mysteries, and its most abstract principles of moral truth, with its simplest and most practical precepts. God, indeed, appeared, when to the poor the Gospel was preached.

In a former paper, we were led to consider the limits of man's will; and we find it, as defined by St. James, free to all evil, impotent to any good. We find that all evil, moral and physical, all sin and suffering, are the result of man's depraved will and affections. We are then taught to look into the profound abysses of the Divine mind, and enough is revealed to shew, that "every good gift, and perfect gift, is from above;" and, more particularly, that God's choicest and best gift, regenerating and sanctifying grace, for the purchase of which "He spared not His own Son, but freely gave Him up for us all," is the result of the Divine will, alone, as its moving cause: "of His own will begat he us, by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures." From these high speculations upon the power of the Divine, and the limits of the human will, we are led, almost insensibly, to a plain and practical exhortation, grounded upon this assertion just made, that the word of truth is the great instrument by which the Divine will operates the regeneration of a soul. And, therefore, the Apostle calls upon you to "receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." Not, however, as we shall see, with the meekness of apathy, or of sloth; but with the meekness of wisdom: with the meekness of unresisting submission, of active, uncompromising obedience.

There is in man's corrupt nature, averse as it is from holiness, a proneness to silence conviction, by endeavouring to compromise with God for a partial obedience to His strict and holy law: to satisfy conscience in the neglect of some duties by a performance of others: and, more particularly, to substitute ceremonial rites and formal observances for that living sacrifice of body, soul, and spirit, which alone is man's reasonable service, and which alone can meet the demands of that God who is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. To meet and counteract this evil propensity, is the main object of St. James throughout his epistle. He plainly intimates, that the most regular observance of ceremonial duties; that the most scrupulous attention to the different ordinances of worship; that the frequent hearing of the Divine word; that all these means of grace are, as the very term implies, designed but as means to a further end; which end is, that the law of God may be transcribed from these tables of stone to the fleshly tables of the heart: that the Gospel may be written there, in its fulness and spirituality; not with pen and ink, but with the Spirit of the living God: and that it may emanate from thence, in the daily walk and conversation, in the uninterrupted flow of a righteous, sober, and godly life. This is the *end*, worthy of God, which the various instituted means of grace contemplate: and unless this end be effected, however excellent they may be in their own nature, however beneficial to others, to you they are weak and beggarly elements, and can profit you nothing. He who offers this merely formal allegiance, and by the service of the lips cries, Lord, Lord, but does not the thing that He says; he who thus professes to know God, but in works denies Him—who is a hearer of the word, but not a doer—deceiveth his own self; and his professions, and his opportunities, will but justify and embrace his condemnation. That servant which knew his lord's will, and did things worthy of stripes, has but this sad pre-eminence, that he shall be beaten with many stripes. He who, by means, is exalted unto heaven, shall, by those very means, if rejected, be thrust down into hell.

The Apostle here divides men into two classes:

I. Those who are hearers only; and,

II. Those who are doers of the word.

I. The former of these he compares to a man beholding his natural face in a glass: perceiving on it spots and blemishes which should be removed, but when he turns from the view, his mind is so pre-occupied with other objects and other thoughts, that he straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was; and suffers these deformities to remain, without adopting any measures for their removal.

And why is it that the word of truth, which is able to save the soul, does not produce its designed effect on all? Because all will not look into this mirror, for the purposes of conviction and instruction in righteousness. Few indeed voluntarily turn to it. Few hear more of "the word of truth" than is obtruded upon their attention by the different services of God's house, to which custom brings them: and they come to it with minds so unprepared, that the seed sown cannot strike root; with hearts so pre-occupied by worldly interests and affections, that the word preached cannot profit them. The most awakening, impressive, and affecting declarations of "the word of truth" strike upon hearts which have been made a hard and beaten thoroughfare to the world and its vanities, and can make there no impression. They can hear Christ himself declare in his word, "Except ye repent ye shall perish: unless a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." They can hear that word of truth declare, that without holiness no man can see the Lord: and not only do these awfully awakening declarations fail in bringing them to examine whether they have been, themselves, the subjects of those important charges, without which this highest and most infallible authority has pronounced that their destiny shall be everlasting perdition, but they fail in exciting even a transient curiosity to know what those mysterious, and to them unintelligible, charges mean, while yet they are pronounced thus essential to their salvation. It is true that they thus escape all painful convictions of sin, all the horrors of a disturbed conscience, all distressing fears about the future: but oh! remember that this apathy of soul is but as the dead calm of nature which precedes the bursting of the earthquake or volcano: that it is but the stupor of moral death: that it is but the awful stillness and the dark clouding of the gathering tempest, from which the thunders of an angry heaven will shortly burst, and which will enwrap the wreck of a desolated soul in the blackness of darkness for ever.

But there are some in whose minds the hearing of "the word of truth" awakens transient convictions, which yet are as the grass growing upon the house top, that withereth afore it groweth up. Instead of studying to cherish and deepen these impressions; converting every conviction into a prayer for persevering grace; reducing every good to practice, so that it may become a habit of mind and life, they return into the world, and dissipate every serious feeling in levity and worldliness. Thus they live on, now convinced and repenting, the next moment unconvinced and sinning; each flowing wave which the world pours in upon their minds obliterating the faint characters, which, during its ebb, "the sword of the Spirit" had traced upon their hearts. There are but few minds formed of such firm materials as to retain an impression through unfavourable and opposing circumstances. To most, the last speaker, who speaks with

power sufficient to impress them, gives the tone and character. And, therefore, it would be wise, as it is but decent and seemly, that in our meetings for public worship, the last speaker should be the minister of God; the last voice which each hears in the house of God that which has implored upon him the blessing of the Sacred Trinity: and that the spirit in which he returns to his home should be that calm serenity, that holy peace, that unworldly spirit of communion with God, with which the minister of God dismissed him. Instead of this, it is too generally the case, that greeting and salutations, the news of the day, the business of the morrow, cares or pleasures, levity or worldliness in whatever guise, dissipate the impressions which the services of God's house were designed to produce. Upon a meeting in which God has promised His especial presence, another meeting is grafted by Satan, in which every man preaches vanity to his neighbour; and, like the fowls of the air, picks up the good seed sown in his heart, lest he should believe and be saved. When our public services have closed, all should separate as soon as propriety permits. Each should return to his respective home, and seek to carry with him the spirit and the impressions which they produced. He should retire to his closet, and shut to the door, and meditate upon the word spoken, and pray to his Father which is in secret. He should plead with him His own promises for a blessing upon His own word: and in the strength of this spiritual meat, he should enter upon his daily walk of life with renewed vigour, and with renewed purposes of *patient* and *active* obedience. Then will he be, not a hearer only,—not a forgetful hearer, who has trifled away opportunities, and sinned away convictions; who has resisted, grieved, and quenched the Divine Spirit, until at length he has been abandoned by a long-suffering God, and given over to an undiscerning and unfeeling mind: but he will be one of those of whom the Apostle proceeds to speak, who "looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein; he not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work;" and of whom he pronounces that "this man shall be blessed in his deed."

II. In the words, "Whoso looketh into," or more properly, "Whose *stoopeth* to the perfect law of liberty, and *continueth* therein," there is an evident allusion to the bending posture of the cherubim, *fixed* in the temple, and *stooping* over the mercy seat, and ark of the testament; "which things the angels desire to look into." The cherubim, thus fixed, furnish a just emblem of the man who is not an occasional and superficial inquirer into the Divine word, but who steadfastly and intently studies it, that he may draw near to the Saviour, and the mercy seat, which it reveals; and also that he may know, and, by his own personal experience, "prove, what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God," which is "our sanctification." Thus does he imbibe that filial spirit of adoption whereby he cries Abba, Father: and thus does he transcribe the precepts of the Gospel into his own heart.

It is called a "*perfect* law," because it fulfils the prophecies, and consummates the types of the ceremonial dispensation, which made nothing perfect: because it reveals a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world: cleanses the heart from an evil conscience, and purges conscience from dead works; satisfying it that, through the one offering upon the cross, God can be just and yet the

justifier of the ungodly: and, also, because it contains a perfect copy of that holy law, which is the faithful transcript of the mind of God; where there is nothing deficient, nothing superfluous; to which he who adds, and from which he who takes aught, are alike cursed.

It is called a *law*: for although the Christian is indeed dead to the law through the body of Christ; though that corrupt nature to which alone the law appealed, and on which it cast its yoke of bondage—for law was not made for a righteous man, but for the ungodly and profane—be crucified with Christ; yet the regenerated Christian is not without law to God, but under the law of Christ. But that law of Christ is love, is *liberty*. The Gospel has redeemed its pledge: it has put the law into his mind, and written it in his heart, in characters of love; with "the finger of God"—the Spirit of holiness. And where that Spirit is, there is liberty: liberty, not merely from the ceremonial law, which the Apostle pronounced to be an intolerable yoke of bondage; not merely from the damnatory sentence of the violated moral law, "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them;" nor yet merely from the fear of death, which all life long must bring into bondage the guilty and unreconciled conscience: but also an inward liberty of soul; a freedom from the arbitrary tyranny of lawless passions, and unruly tempers, and debasing lusts, which hurry it, a passive and impotent slave, whither, frequently, it would not: liberty to obey the dictates of reason, and the suggestions of conscience: and, when the still small voice of the Spirit of God whispers in the ear of the inner man, "This is the way, walk thou in it," liberty to enter upon those ways of pleasantness and paths of peace to which the finger of God points. Such is the liberty in which that man walks who loves God's commandments. He is emancipated from every restraint of God's law, because he loves that law with his whole heart: he has become that law to himself. Obedience to it is the instinct of his new nature, the temper of his regenerated soul; and, therefore, to him, "God's service is perfect freedom."

This perfect law of liberty is also, as the Apostle describes it, a faithful mirror, which shows the man who attentively looks into it what he is; and not only this, but also what he ought to be. What he is, by probing with its warnings and exhortations the mass of corruption within him, and displaying the workings of depraved nature: with this sword of the Spirit laying his bosom bare, and naked, and open; and discerning the thoughts and intents, the unanalyzed motives, the secret desires and purposes of his heart: then, speaking authoritatively, as with the voice of God, "Thou art the man!" and thus convincing him of sin. It shews him what he ought to be, by holding up to him the only true standard of moral rectitude, the good, and holy, and perfect will of God: by exhibiting to him, in the life and conversation of Christ, a perfect pattern of all righteousness, as a model for his imitation: by opening to his view the treasures of the Divine bosom, accommodated to the nature of man, and revealing to him the mind of Christ. He there sees the voluntary, self-abasing humility of God manifest in flesh. He sees the meekness and gentleness of Christ; the patient endurance of undeserved reproach, and of all the unreasonable contradictions of sinners. He sees the infinite compassions of that Divine bosom, which no infatuated opposition could weary, and no ingratitude could revolt. He sees the unceasing self-denial; the awful and the sin-repelling

purity; the holy love; the weanedness of affection from the world and its interests; the devout and heaven-tending affections; the love of solitude, of meditation, of prayer; and yet the cheerful readiness to leave this feast of soul, and mingle in the busy haunts of men at the call of duty, when His Father's business, when an opportunity of promoting the happiness of man, summoned Him. He sees all these features of Deity, not in cold and isolated precepts, but embodied in his own nature—manifest in flesh—exposed to and assailed by all those temptations to which he himself is subject, the fruits of victory over them. He sees them, not as objects with which, though interesting, he has no personal concern; not as treasures beyond his grasp: the same Hand which alone could hold up to him this Image of the Invincible God, and thus proves itself Divine, beckons him to come near; and that voice, which alone could reveal to him the mind of Christ, and which quickeneth whom it will, bids this "Lazarus come forth!" and stripping him of the grave clothes which encumbered and enfettered him, animating and equipping him for the work, bids him, "Be holy, for I thy God am holy:" "Be of good cheer for I have overcome the world:" I have finished the work which my Father gave me to do: "Go and do thou likewise."

But who are those, who fully avail themselves of the glorious privileges which the word and the Spirit of Christ confer? Who are those, even of those who are not dead in trespasses and sins, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ, who are at all awakened, as they ought to be, to the concerns of eternity? Where are those, whom the motives which revelation brings to bear upon the soul impress in any degree proportioned to their great, their overwhelming importance? Were we in spiritual health and vigour, would not those ordinances, in which God promises to meet us, find our souls in absorbed attention, in holy calm, in deep devotion? Would not prayer, which is a converse of the soul with God, touch every spring within, and elicit every faculty? Would not every text of Scripture, read or heard, tell upon the soul? Would not every threatening of Scripture—I will not say alarm, for "perfect love casteth out fear"—but solemnize our spirit? Would not every warning of Scripture produce deep searchings of heart? Would not every precept of Scripture be hailed with delight, as opening new vistas to ways of pleasantness and paths of peace, and all leading to the many mansions of our Father's house? Would not the promises of Scripture wean the heart from earth, and elevate the affections to things above? Would not the revelation of God, so loving a guilty and rebellious world, that He spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all—would not the history of Christ, who loved us, and, while we were yet enemies, gave himself for us—would not the character of Christ, meek and pure, lovely and full of love, kindle such a flame of sympathetic feeling in the soul, as would waft it heavenwards, in grateful adoration and holy love? Would not the whole soul, like the well tuned instrument, respond to every touch of the Master's hand; so that every chapter of Scripture would sweep a full chord of affections in the soul; and produce a swell of sacred harmony, an anthem of hope, of gratitude, of devotion, of holy love to God?

But who is the subject of such an experience? Who has realized the full salvation of the Gospel? Who has the whole mind of Christ? No sigh indeed of penitence, no faithful conflict with sin, no progress

in holiness, shall in any wise lose its free reward of covenanted, though unmerited grace; but it is of the advanced Christian alone, who has drunk deeply into the spirit of the "word of truth," that we can say, in the full meaning of the Apostle's declaration, "This man is blessed *in* his deed." He waits not for a reversionary heaven, the purchase of painful austerities, and self-denying privations, and severe conflicts with besetting and beloved sins. He has, with the Psalmist, found by experience, that *in* keeping of God's commandments there is great reward. The kingdom of heaven is within him, that kingdom which "is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." The peace of God, calm yet sensitive, cheerful yet subdued, a peace which passeth all understanding, and which the world can neither give nor take away, presides in his heart; puts to rest every stormy and impetuous passion; quiets every angry temper; sooths every impatient and discontented feeling; brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. The Spirit of Christ descending, as upon the wings of a dove, or as the soft and silent dews of evening which refresh the earth, diffuses a sweet serenity, a holy calm, throughout his breast. Present peace terminates in prospects of "glory, honour, and immortality." Its daily fruit is holiness: the end everlasting life.

J. M. H.

RELINQUISHED MISSIONS:—FIRST MORAVIAN MISSION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

For the Christian Observer.

We have not forgotten the interesting and instructive series of occasional papers which we commenced under the title of "Relinquished Missions;" but which the pressure of other topics has prevented our lately adding to. We will not, however, allow our present volume to close without one of these salutary reminiscences; and we have one to present, which we think will well reward perusal. It is that of George Schmidt, the first missionary of the United Brethren in South Africa, who went out thither in the year 1736, and returned home in 1744 in great despondency; and was not permitted by the Dutch East India Company to go back. In strictness, we ought to have said a *suspended* instead of a *relinquished* mission, as Schmidt did not intend finally to abandon his post; and Count Zinzendorf and his friends, who never abandoned the enterprise, succeeded, four years after, in procuring a licence for another missionary to go out. It comes, however, sufficiently within the scope of our title to allow of our inserting the narrative.

George Schmidt was born at Kunewalde, in Moravia, September 30, 1709. No record of his parentage and early life has been preserved; all that is known of him dates from the year 1725, when he was led to serious impressions of religion through the instrumentality of John Boehme. In the year following he emigrated to Herrnhut. In 1728 he accompanied Melchior Nitschmann, one of the first Elders of the congregation, on a visit to the Protestants of Saltzburg, who were at that time suffering much persecution, in order to encourage and strengthen them in the hope of the Gospel. But, calling on their way at Lititz, in Bohemia, to see the remnant of the ancient Brethren's

church at that place, they were seized and put in prison, being accused of a design to make proselytes. All the exertions of Count Zinzendorf to procure their liberation were without effect; and, in the February following, Nitschmann died in prison at Schildberg, while Schmidt was kept six years in rigorous confinement, until he was released in 1734. The following is his own simple narrative of these events:—

"When Melchior Nitschmann and I first mentioned our projected journey to the congregation at Herrnhut, they were much opposed to it; they laid it, however, before the Lord in prayer, beseeching Him, either to remove the impression from our minds, or, if it were His will that we should go, to strengthen and confirm it. Our conviction continued firm, and, accordingly, we left Herrnhut, April 26. Countess Zinzendorf, in whose household I had been engaged, gave us four florins (about 6s. 8d.) for our journey. With this, and a single change of linen, we set out, the Count giving us his parting blessing. We hoped to reach Austria, though we expected nothing from the Papists but imprisonment, fetters, and death. We proceeded by way of Leibe and Hirschberg in Silesia, to Schenkowitz in Bohemia, on the Moravian border, where we visited some acquaintances, and held a meeting for the awakened. A stranger was present on this occasion, who afterwards betrayed us to the Romish chaplain. Meanwhile we went on to Carlsdorf, where a woman, named Demuth, resided with two daughters, one of whom afterwards married Brother Lawatsch. She begged us to visit her third daughter, who was married to a Roman Catholic at Friese. The young woman accompanied us thither, and the husband allowed us to hold a meeting in his house that evening. While we were thus engaged, the chaplain above mentioned came with a great crowd of people, who surrounded the house, and took us prisoners. Melchior Nitschmann's Halle Bible lay on the table, which the chaplain took, remarking that this was the first time he had ever seen the book in his life. He then asked, if I also had not some heretical books; on which I handed to him a New Testament, which I had in my pocket. Having tied our hands fast with ropes, they now led us away to a public-house, where they put us in irons, and carried us from thence to Eisenberg. Here we were examined before two deacons, who interrogated us as to where we were born, how long we had lived in Saxony, the object of our present expedition, and various other particulars. After this investigation, we were taken to Schildberg, and confined in separate apartments; where, however, though too remote for conversation, we could hear each other sing the hymns with which, alternately, we solaced and cheered our spirits. Every night my feet were made fast in the stocks. A new form of salutation had just been introduced amongst the Romanists; one party saying, 'Praised be Jesus Christ!' and the other responding, 'For ever, Amen!' A priest asked me what I thought of it. I said, it was excellent if repeated in sincerity; to which he answered, 'You blockhead, who could repeat it otherwise?' We had frequent visits from a Jesuit, who disputed with us, and offered to stake his soul on the truth of his opinions. We constantly appealed to the Bible. At first, many came to listen on these occasions; but when the Jesuit saw that he gained no laurels, he forbade their attendance. At length, finding that he could make nothing of us, he grew tired of his task, and left us in displeasure.

"We lay confined in this manner till Christmas. As the weather was very cold, the mayor had ordered me a supply of fire-wood, but the turnkey preferred making use of it for his own fire, so that I was almost frozen to death. I wound straw-bands round my feet at night, as I lay in the stocks, but my sufferings continued dreadful. I turned to the Lord for help, and He took away the sense of pain almost entirely. To this day, however, I feel the effects of it in my feet, every winter. Being now half-frozen, I lost all appetite for food, and my visitors thought I designed to starve myself to death; in consequence of which I was removed to a warmer cell, though without light; and Frank Wander, of Schenkowitz, at whose house we held our first meeting, was incarcerated along with me. He was in a dying state, but begged me to keep it secret, that he might not be harassed by the priests. I watched with him for many nights, and he expired in my arms. Some days after, they brought Melchior Nitschmann, who was also ill, into my dark cell, after taking off his irons. Weak and suffering as I was, I also watched with him. On the fourth night, I asked him how he felt. He answered, 'I have hold of my Saviour; He does not leave me, nor I Him.' Soon after, his spirit left the worn-out body. My gaolers now wrote to the Consistory, for directions where to bury the two corpses, and received orders to

bury them by a cross at the entry of the town. Coffins were furnished, on my offering to bear the expense, and so they were interred."

We cannot but interrupt the narrative to remark how closely, in every age, persecution has knit together the members of Christ's mystical body; who, in the day of outward prosperity, are too apt to think more of what they differ in, than in what they agree. The affecting incidents related by Schmidt resemble the narratives of Bocardo prison, Bonner's coal-house, and the dungeons of the Tower of London. Many years after, Schmidt, writing to John Nitschmann, the brother of his departed friend, says, "You ask, whether I have forgotten your brother, the companion of my captivity. No, most assuredly; I never can forget him. As long as my pulse beats, my love to him will endure, till we shall meet together before the throne of the Lamb, and see, face to face, Him whom we served on earth." There is a pathos in this, beautifully expressive of the hallowed communion of saints.

The narrative continues:

"A quarter of a year after, the mayor came to me in prison, and told me I must go with him in my fetters. Men with lances and spears escorted me through the street to the vicar's house. Here several priests was assembled, who asked me whether I had thought over the matter. I answered, 'Yes:' but when I was proceeding to say more, they stopped me, observing, that they well knew my perverseness; but they had written about me to his Holiness the Pope, and I must now hear his answer. Accordingly they read a paper, stating that, since I had departed from the faith, removed to Saxony, and been preaching for three years (they should have said three weeks) in Bohemia, and would not suffer myself to be restored to the true faith, I was to be excommunicated, and cut off from all intercourse with mankind. I was then led back to prison, where I continued two years more, seeing nobody but the mayor and the gaoler. The former once observed to me, that I did not seem to care much for the excommunication, to which I replied, 'The Lord is with me, He is my comfort, and He has said, "They shall cast you out for my name's sake."' Some time after he came again, and said, he wondered that I had not long ago made my escape. I assured him, that I should not leave my cell till they fetched me out. My case had meanwhile been laid before the civil court of Prague, by which I was sentenced, in 1731, to three years' labour in the fortress of Spielberg, near Brunn. I was, therefore, removed thither, under a guard, and employed on the fortifications, and in other still more revolting tasks. My whole daily allowance was a small roll of bread (which was just then very dear), so that I could scarcely satisfy my hunger. During the last year of my term, I was transferred to the kitchen of a subaltern officer. When the year was expired, he took on himself the responsibility of dismissing me, and liberated me from my irons. I was furnished with a passport by the commissary, and returned by way of Olmutz to Herrnhut, where I arrived in safety, July 22d, 1734."

In 1735 Schmidt set out on a journey through Bohemia into Voigtland, and from thence visited his brethren in the Palatinate and Switzerland. In 1736 he returned to Herrnhut, and received a call to go out as a missionary to the Cape of Good Hope. The following is his own narrative of his voyage to Cape Town, and his residence in South Africa till the year 1744:—

"Two clergymen of Amsterdam, Messrs. Van Alphen and De Bruyn, having inquired of the congregation at Herrnhut, whether they could not send out a person to proclaim the Gospel to the Hottentots, the matter was taken into consideration, and a regular proposal was made to me to engage in this work. I left Herrnhut February 14th, and arrived in Amsterdam March 9th. Immediately on my arrival, I applied to the burgomaster for leave to proceed to the Cape. He advised me to address a memorial to the East India Company, stating my desire to preach the Gospel to the poor heathen there, out of love to them and the Redeemer, and requesting a passage in one of their ships. On my doing this, some ministers of the Reformed Church were deputed to examine me. After I had answered several questions on different articles of faith, one of them objected,

that the Hottentot language was a very difficult one, and that, as the natives grew no corn, but subsisted entirely on the roots of the country, I should not be able to get a living amongst them. My reply was—'All things are possible with God, and being assured that He has sent me to this people, I believe that He will help me, both in small things and in great.' To this they expressed their assent, observing, that my good intentions were not to be despised: moreover they wished me success in my undertaking. On hearing of their approval, the Directors of the East India Company gave me permission to make the voyage to the Cape in one of their vessels, and recommended me to the two Governors of the Colony. As we did not, however, sail for some months, I meanwhile employed myself in the garden of Br. Graffman, and in other manual occupations. At length, I embarked December 4th; but adverse winds kept us in port till March 11th, 1737. The text for the day was—'The way of the just is difficult: but thou makest straight the way of the just' (Isaiah xxvi. 7, according to Luther's version); the following lines from an ancient hymn being added:—

'Thy paths may strange and devious seem—
But yet are straight: should tempests rage,
Amid the desolating blast
Thy calming voice is heard at last.'

"We were now borne rapidly forward, and on the 10th of May crossed the Line. I had frequent opportunities, during the voyage, of commending the love of the Saviour to others: some of my fellow-passengers were awakened by my testimony of Jesus, and covenanted together to remain faithful to the Lord, to maintain fellowship of spirit with each other, and to testify of Him in whom they believed, during their sojourn in the East Indies, whither they were bound. On the 18th of June, we came in sight of the mountains of the Cape, but were obliged by unfavourable winds to run into a neighbouring bay, where we lay for a whole fortnight. Here we went on shore, and I saw the first Hottentots—a sight for which I had ardently longed. My heart was set upon these people, and I was glad to find that I could converse with them a little in Dutch. The text appointed for the day was—'This people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise' (Isaiah xliii. 21). On the 9th of July, we came safely to anchor in Table Bay. The same day, I delivered my letters to their Excellencies, who received me with great kindness, especially Mr. Van Kerbel. On returning to my inn, I found the company making themselves merry about the parson who was come to convert the Hottentots. When, however, I avowed myself to be the man, the landlord apologised, and gave the conversation another turn. Five days after, Captain Rhenius, hearing of me, sent and offered me board and lodging at his house, which I thankfully accepted. By his advice, I waited on the members of the Council, who expressed themselves friendly to my object.

"July 23rd, I travelled 20 miles inland, and again saw a number of Hottentots, whom I addressed. In a few days, I returned to town, and stayed there till the 4th of September, when I again travelled 60 miles up the country, in the company of a serjeant, who had come to fetch rations for his regiment. Along with him were two Hottentots, named Afriko and Kibbodo. September 13th, I reached the river Sonderend, at the Company's post in Soetemelks valley. The same day, I visited Africo in his hut, the only one that was to be seen, all the others living in tents. He and his people came to meet me with music, having been told that I was come to teach them. I conversed for a short time with Africo, who could speak Dutch fluently, and took a survey of their dwellings and the vicinage. As I was setting out to return on foot, Africo pressed me to accept the loan of his horse. Before I reached home, I came to the determination to take up my residence the very next day among the Hottentots. My intention was to run up for myself a small hut of wicker-work; but the serjeant offered me his tent, till I could build a hut of more durable materials. The text for September 15th, the day I pitched this tent, though unknown to me at the time, was remarkable—*Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes*—(Isaiah, liv. 2). The next day, I took my spade, and began to lay out a garden, having brought some packets of seeds from Cape-Town. I felt already quite at home. The Hottentots lent me their assistance in raising the walls of my house, for which I gave them daily portions of tobacco. In six weeks the roof was raised, supported by six pillars, and I slept under it at night, though it was yet open on every side. The day was spent in this labour, and in the evening I visited the Hottentots, and exerted myself to acquire their language. Its three clicks, however, were more than I could master; and my attempts to imitate them diverted them exceedingly. I therefore resolved to teach them to read Dutch. Africo

was my interpreter. Amongst the rest I asked him, if they knew that there was a great Spirit above, who had given them their cattle, and all things. 'Yes,' he said, 'we know it.' 'And what is his name?' 'Toiqua.' 'That,' I rejoined, 'is God our Saviour, and I am come to you on purpose to make you acquainted with Him.' He answered—'That is good, Baas.'

"October 27th, I began my Dutch lessons with the Hottentots; but it was a long time before they could pronounce the letters. When they at length succeeded, others were smitten with the desire of learning, and offered themselves as pupils. Some of them also brought their children.—The corporal of the station, Charles Kampen, sometimes came to my hut, and I spoke much to him of Jesus. His heart was soon deeply impressed; he manifested great tenderness of spirit, and remained my attached friend, till our Saviour took him to himself.

"April 23rd, 1738, I quitted my dwelling, finding it too near to the military station; and moved with 18 Hottentots, who had become attached to me, to a desert spot on Serjeant's River, about 12 miles from the post. There I built another hut, laid out a garden, and taught my Hottentots the arts of tillage and planting. May 4th, I recommenced the school, and held evening meetings with them. One of them, named William, who appeared to be impressed with the Saviour's love, I took under my special care. He became a useful labourer among his countrymen, and told them, in their own language, that he felt within his heart the truth of what I said to them concerning Jesus. He would also retire to pray with them, which he usually did previous to the evening meeting.

"The Hottentots are mostly of a heavy temperament, and spend much time in sleep. In moonlight nights, however, they amuse themselves with dancing, jumping, and singing; keeping, at the same time, a sharp look-out on their cattle, which suffer grievously in the dark nights from lions and tigers. They are generally small of stature, of a yellow complexion, and with hair like black wool. They have thick lips and flat noses, like the negroes. Their garments consist of a couple of sheep-skins sewed together, and smeared with grease, to preserve them from the sun. Herds of kine and sheep compose their wealth. They live on milk and boiled meat, with which they eat wild roots, also boiled, instead of bread. The anise-root is the best of these vegetables; another species resembles potatoes; and there are two other smaller kinds besides. They follow no husbandry, but rove about with their cattle from place to place, according to the convenience of pasturage, generally in hordes, possessing four to six tents under one chief. They have no religious worship or rites of any kind; but they believe in the existence of a great Spirit, a devil, whom they call Gauna, and a Heaven, which they call Huma.

"By degrees they came to me in greater numbers, and some left me their children to be taught to read Dutch, giving me a cow or two along with them, to supply them with milk. The number who attended the school and meetings varied from 30 to 50. In the latter, Africo, Kibbodo, and William, bore a pleasing testimony to my doctrine, acknowledging that they were slaves of sin, and needed the Saviour's blood to free them from its power. On my asking William, on one of these occasions, about the state of his mind, he declared—'Though all my friends should leave our Saviour, I will not; for He has the words of eternal life. I am not yet what I ought to be, but I will pray to the Lord, and abide with Him, till I truly experience the merits of his death within my heart.'

"Sometimes I had visits from Dutch colonists; and one day a party of five came together, who afterwards made a favourable report of me and my doctrine at Cape-Town.

"When I had spent upwards of a year in my solitude at Serjeant's River, Brothers David Nitschmann and Dr. Eller, who were going out as missionaries to Ceylon, arrived at Cape-Town, July 28th, just as I happened to be there on business. My joy at seeing them was extreme, and I remained with them till the 13th of August, when they prosecuted their voyage. They brought me intelligence of the persecution which had broken out in Holland against the Brethren, and a letter of instructions from Count Zinzendorf, in which he wrote amongst the rest—'Preserve, dear Brother, the precious treasure which has been committed to you. Let our Jesus be your all.—Labour to convince the Hottentots that they are sinners, and then bring them to His feet, to seek for mercy. Oh! could I open out my whole heart to you, and fill you with my burning desire after these souls: but I know that you have it already. Now, may the Shibboleth of his little flock, the doctrine of the blood of Jesus, the eternal sacrifice, the peace He brought in by his flesh, the election of grace, testified by the nail-prints in His hands and the wound in His side, be your strength and your joy.'

(To be concluded in the Appendix.)

LATIN LINES ON THE OFFERINGS OF THE WISE MEN OF THE EAST.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

As your correspondents have not noticed my request, last year, for an English metrical version of the antique epigram upon the offering of the wise men of the East to the Infant Saviour, I again send the lines, as affording an appropriate Christmas exercise for those who have time and taste for such tasks. Though mixed up with the fable of "the three kings of Cologne," Melchior presenting the gold, Jasper the frankincense, and Bathaser the myrrh, the turn of thought is beautiful, and the allusion to the threefold offering scriptural. Myrrh denotes tears, not only from its bitterness, but because some of the old writers considered it as having reference to our Lord's sepulchre. He had gold, they say, as a king; frankincense as a priest; and myrrh (indicative of embalmment) as being to die as a sacrifice; or, as the epigram turns it, incense to him as God, and myrrh as man.

Tres reges Regi regum tria dona ferebant;
Myrrham homini, uncto aurum, thure dedere Deo.
Tu tria fac itidem dones pia munera Christo,
Muneribus gratus si cupis esse tuis.
Pro myrrha, lachrymas; auro, cor porrige purum;
Pro thure, ac humili pectore funde preces.

There is an old bald English version, which I subjoin; but your correspondents could easily make a better, omitting also the part about the "three kings," of which nothing is said in Scripture.

Three kings the King of kings three gifts did bring;
Myrrh, incense, gold; as to God, man, and king.
Let three pure gifts be likewise given by thee
To Christ, even such as acceptable be:
For myrrh, tears; for frankincense, impart
Submissive prayers; for pure gold, a pure heart.

S. S.

ON THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Your correspondent, "A Protestant," in your November Number, should not have so much confined himself to one class of evils arising from auricular confession as carried on by the Romanist priesthood, as though these were the only baneful results of that unscriptural court of inquisition;—I say "so much," for though he alludes to its being made to minister to "pride, avarice, revenge, oppression, licentiousness, and the love of domination," he dwells chiefly upon one of these heads, so that the others lose their due prominence. He justly remarks that such a tribunal may be abused to purposes of licentiousness, as is irrefragably proved by history, by papal decrees and ordinances, and by the very circumstances of the case; but it is at least equally susceptible of abuse for any other of the ends above specified; and it must and will be thus abused, while priests are men and not angels. They creep into houses; they possess themselves of every domestic secret; they are the depositaries of all the wishes, and fears, and opinions, and follies, and crimes of their delu-

ded followers; they secretly influence the minds of persons in every station of life; the Jesuits, in particular, made it an especial part of their policy to gain the ear of persons of elevated station and extensive influence; and thus, whether money or power, honour or revenge, be the object of their desire, they must have many avenues for obtaining it, unknown even to the victims of their machinations. They instil into the minds of their flocks an opinion that whatever is uttered in the confessional is sacredly secret; it is necessary to keep up this opinion, otherwise people would not confess, and the priest would lose both his power and his fees: but they can give no guarantee that the knowledge obtained will not be used furtively in whatever way may be convenient to the depositary of the secret. What exaction, what extortion, what humiliating or sinful compliance, would most persons dare to refuse to a man who had become possessed of a secret involving their character, and it might be their property, their liberty, or their life. "Paddy, if you do not pay me my dues, you know I can get you hanged any day;" would be a powerful whisper from a Maynooth priest to an Irish Rockite, who had confessed to him the crime of murder. "Mary Murphy, if you do not behave handsomely to the church, every body will come to find out every thing you ever did—not that I shall ever tell; oh, no! but God and providence I am sure will"—would be no feeble argument to enforce a respectable fee at a station. And then, on the other hand, so long as the priest is kept in good humour, how safe is the most atrocious crime in his keeping, and how delightful is his absolution. I lately read in the newspapers the following uncontradicted statement:

"The Popish priest of Halifax has publicly made the following declaration from his own mass-house:—'If I were called in a court of justice to swear as to the character of a man accused of murder, who had confessed his guilt to me in my confessional, I would swear that I knew nothing against his moral character!' The priest says he is justified in this perjury from the oath he took to the Pope and Council not to divulge the secrets of the confessional."

Is not this horrible? And, let me ask, does the law of England permit such a disclosure to a priest to be kept secret as a privileged communication? I have heard that some of the courts in Ireland have decided that it does; perhaps one of your Irish correspondents would say whether I am misinformed: for such an allowance is a direct premium upon crime. Common sense, and law also, I should have thought, would decide that the priest, by keeping the secret is an accessory after the fact; more especially as by absolving the criminal he "comforts and abets" him.

The above is not a solitary instance; it is merely one illustration of the general system. The direful character of that system has been so fearfully described by the Rev. Mr. Nolan, from his own personal knowledge and experience, that if any of your readers have not seen his publication, I should do injustice to the cause of truth and righteousness to withhold from them the following appalling extract:—

"During the last three years I discharged the duty of a Romish clergyman, my heart often shuddered at the idea of entering the confessional. The thoughts of the many crimes I had to bear, the growing doubt upon my mind that confession was an erroneous doctrine, that it tended more to harden than reclaim the heart, and that through it I should be rendered instrumental in ministering destruction to your souls, were awful considerations to me in the hours of my reflection. The recitals of *the murderous acts* I had often heard through this iniquitous tribunal has cost me many a restless night, and are still fixed with horror upon my memory. But, my friends, the most awful consideration is this—that through

the confessional I had been *frequently apprised of intended assassinations and most diabolical conspiracies*, and still from the *ungodly injunctions of secrecy*, in the Romish creed, lest, as Peter Dens says, *the confessional should become odious, I dared not give the slightest intimation to the marked-out victims of slaughter.* But though my heart now trembles at the recollection of the murderous acts, still duty obliges me to proceed, and give one instance of the cases alluded to.

"The case of a person who was barbarously murdered, and with whose intended assassination I became acquainted at confession. One of the five conspirators (all of whom were sworn to commit the horrid deed) broached to me the bloody conspiracy in the confessional. I implored him to desist from his intention of becoming an accomplice to so diabolical a design. But alas! all advice was useless; no dissuasion could prevail, his determination was fixed, and his only reason for having disclosed the awful machination to his confessor seemed to have originated from a hope that his wicked design would be hallowed by his previous acknowledgment to his priest. Finding all my remonstrances unavailing, I then recurred to stratagem. I earnestly besought of him to mention the circumstance to me out of the confessional, in order that I might apprise the intended victim of his danger, or caution the conspirators against the committal of so inhuman a deed. But here ingenuity itself failed in arresting the career of his satanic obstinacy. The conspirator's illegal oath, and his apprehension of himself becoming the victim of brutal assassination, should he be known as the revealer of the conspiracy, rendered him inflexible to my entreaties; and awful to relate—yes, awful, and the hand that now pens it shudders at the record it makes—a poor inoffensive man, the victim of slaughter, died a most cruel death by the hands of ruthless assassins.

"Oh, my dear Protestant countrymen, you will now naturally ask, whether am I, or the perpetrators of the bloody deed, most to be censured—I who knew the murderers and the murdered previous to the act—I who had met the intended victim in the public streets but a short time antecedent to his death? But, my friends, the prejudices of my early life in favour of the doctrine of auricular confession, and the influence of subsequent education, instilling into my mind the inviolability of that iniquitous tribunal, must plead before my God and the public as my only apologies for the concealment of the diabolical conspiracy. And now, you Romish priests, I ask you, could the Lord Jesus institute a doctrine so monstrous in its practice, and so subversive of the principles of humanity? a doctrine that beholds the dagger pointed at the human heart, but hushes the warning voice that would apprise the devoted victim of his danger?

"Oh, my Roman Catholic countrymen, why not awaken from your lethargic slumbers—why not arise from the mystic spells that bind you, and cast off that unnatural yoke, which would dare to unite your God in an unholy alliance with such monkish blasphemy? Should any unacquainted with Romanism question the veracity of these statements, let him consult history, and he will find many similar facts. Did not the Romish priest, the Rev. Mr. Garnet, the provincial of the Jesuits, justify his concealment of the gunpowder plot, on the pretext of its being revealed to him at the confession? Did not Father D'Aubigney, the French Jesuit, put forward a similar plea of justification for concealment, when the assassin Ravaillac (that stabbed Henry IV.), in 1610, acknowledged to him in the confessional his plan of regicidal murder? But why need I refer to such circumstances, as every priest who has acted in the capacity of a confessor must admit the fact of similar cases frequently coming before him in the confessional?"

One might have thought that the atrocities of the Romish confessional, its anti-scriptural fabrication of a sacrament under the name of penance, and its superstitious and demoralising practices, would make every Protestant dread and deprecate those usurped powers of priestly domination on which the whole fabric is founded. Yet when I read such lines as I am about to quote from a recent publication, the "Lyra Apostolica,"—I must not call it a Protestant publication, for the divines who hold these doctrines do not allow that the church of England *is* Protestant,—I cannot but see that some Anglican clergymen, not content with the manner in which our church describes the office of the minister of Christ, claim the power usurped by the church of Rome, as successors of the Apostles, to wield the sword and lightnings of heaven, in order to point with fire their awful curse.

These words may sound strangely, but they are those of the sonnet alluded to:

"Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; AND WHOSESOEVER SINS YE RETAIN, THEY ARE RETAINED."

"Behold your armoury!—sword, and lightning shaft,
Cull'd from the stores of God's all-judging ire,
And in your wielding left! The words, that waft
Power to your voice absolving, point with fire
Your awful curse. O grief! should Heaven's dread Sire
Have stayed, for you, the mercy-dews of old
Vouchsafed, when pastors' arms in deep desire
Were spread on high to bless the kneeling fold!
IF CENSURE SLEEP, WILL ABSOLUTION HOLD?
Will the great King affirm their acts of grace
Who careless leave to cankering rust and mould
The flaming sword that should the unworthy chase
From his pure Eden? O beware! lest vain
Their sentence to *remit*, who never dare *retain*."

I am sure, Sir, whatever may be the construction which any true member of the Church of England attaches to the words of the ordination service, or the several forms of absolution, he will not, with this sonnet, or with the popish priesthood, claim for a Protestant pastor those Apostolical powers, which were *not* "left to the wielding" of any uninspired man. These new "Apostolicals," as they call themselves, will find that the laity of England are too well read in Holy Scripture to admit their arrogant and preposterous claims to dominion over the souls and bodies of their fellow-men.

ANTI-BONNER.

REPLY OF "THE LAYMAN" ON THE OXFORD BREVIARY TRACT.

[SEVERAL remonstrances reached us last month for having made ourselves responsible, as was alleged, for a passage in the Layman's Essays, in which he describes the Oxford tract on the Breviary as setting forth for Protestant use certain exceptionable passages, which our correspondents considered explicitly disclaimed in that publication.

Our reply was, First, that, in making large extracts from works reviewed, reviewers do not adopt every statement contained in them; secondly, that in our own remarks upon the Oxford Breviary Tract we had always written correctly even to the very letter; and thirdly, that even if the Layman had expressed himself incorrectly, the spirit of his animadversions was justified by the whole tenor of the Oxford Tracts; and that such is the studied "stealthiness" of these insidious publications, that they almost invariably contrive "so artfully to balance their arguments, as to insinuate mischief, and yet to provide themselves with a refuge against the charges of direct inculcation." We quoted Dr. Pusey's own pregnant admission that "The influence which a man has upon his contemporaries, and upon posterity, depends *entirely* upon his *prominent system of belief*. That which has seized possession of his own mind, is that whereby he influences the minds of others. The more retiring parts of his system, by which it may be to him occasionally modified and controlled, have but little influence upon himself; how should they then have strength enough to reach others?" And we stated that the learned Professor's observations apply forcibly to the Oxford Tracts. "When blame is justly attached to them, in regard to their obvious palpable tendency, some overlooked modification, some exceptive words in a corner, are pointed out, and the objector is accused

of unfairness, because he considered the strong impression left upon the mind of the reader, rather than a few qualifying expressions, which served rather to cover the retreat of the writer, if forced to abandon his position, than to indicate his direct and undeniable object."

This being the case, we did not critically enter into the question whether the Layman had expressed himself with perfect accuracy; we left him, we said, "to his own explanation;" explanation, not *defence;* for we attested our conviction that he was "incapable of wilful misrepresentation;" and that "if he had *inadvertently* conveyed *a wrong impression*" (as the remonstrances sent to us indicated) "he would rejoice to remove it." A wrong impression might be conveyed without being intended; and "explanation," we were sure, was all that was necessary.

That explanation is afforded in the following able and conclusive letter. We owe the writer an apology, that forgetting for a moment the systematic stealthiness of the Oxford Tracts, and overborne by the undoubting assertions of several correspondents, we were led to think that he had laid himself open to the charge of making the Oxford Tract writers include for Protestant use what they had excluded; so that though he was right in spirit and intention, he was not right to the letter. We are glad, however, that we left him to his own explanation; it is triumphantly satisfactory: and it exhibits a new instance of that subtlety of these "Tracts for the Times," by which they convey poison in an unsuspected form. They protest against so much, and so much only, of Romanism, as just opens the way for the admission of the elements of all that is essential to it; for as we have often proved, there is no one particular in which Protestantism differs from Popery, in which they do not attempt to weaken the Protestant argument, and to strengthen the Popish; so that if Dr. Wiseman, or any other Jesuit, considering not what Rome accounts full-blown truth, but what "the times" would bear, had planned and written the whole series, and especially those parts which most strongly protest against a few "practical grievances," as they are mincingly termed, in the proceedings of our "dear sister," he could not have adopted a more insidious and dangerous scheme for counter-working the Protestant reformation, and bringing us back to the superstitions and idolatries of Rome.

But we will not any longer detain our readers from the Layman's letter, which well deserves their careful perusal.]

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,—I am rather pleased than otherwise at the opportunity offered me, by a Correspondent in your last Number, of meeting an objection which I find to be gaining ground in various quarters, against a passage in the last edition of the "*Essays on the Church.*" I allude to a slight mention of the 75th Number of the "*Tracts for the Times,*" which occurs at page 289 of the *Essays;* and in which I am supposed to have "disingenuously" omitted a very material feature in the case. I had quoted certain Prayers to the Virgin, which are given in the said 75th Number; and it is thought that I ought, at the same time, to have stated, that the editor of the tract had "expressed his disapprobation of many of them." The charge, I am quite aware, is a very serious one; and I am therefore happy to be furnished with so early an opportunity of meeting it.

It is impossible for any one properly to understand questions of this sort, without having the whole of the facts before him. This must be my

apology for placing before your readers *the whole passage* to which this charge of "disingenuousness" refers. It is as follows:

"The 75th number of the Tracts for the Times is composed of selections from the Roman Breviary, prepared and recommended for Protestant use; in the preface to which the Editor says:

"'Our adversaries have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure, which was ours as much as theirs. The publication, then, of these selections, is, as it were, an act of re-appropriation.'

"And among these prayers, thus 're-appropriated' to Protestant use, we find the following:

"'Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that we thy servants may ever prosper in perpetual health of body and mind, and by the glorious intercession of the Blessed Mary, Ever-Virgin, may be delivered from present sadness, and enjoy eternal bliss.' (p. 53.)

"'Holy Mary, and all the saints intercede for us to the Lord, that we may be worthy of His help and salvation, who liveth and reigneth world without end.'

"'Therefore, I beseech thee, Blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the Blessed John Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, All saints, and thee, my Father, to pray the Lord our God for me.' (pp. 61, 62.)"

The objection to this statement is, as not unkindly put by your correspondent in the last Christian Observer, that I "affirm that the Editor of the Tract on the Breviary approves of the prayers published by him; whereas he again and again expresses his disapprobation of many of them."

I must therefore next quote this "expression of disapprobation" from the aforesaid 75th Number of the *Tracts for the Times*. It is as follows; and I give it entire and verbatim, only dividing it into two paragraphs, for a reason which I shall presently state.

"(1.) The addresses to the blessed Virgin Mary in the Breviary, as it is at present constituted, are such as the following: the Ave Mary, before commencing every office through the day and at the end of Compline; at the ends of Lauds and Vespers, an Antiphon invocatory of the Virgin; the Officium B. Mariæ, on the Sabbath or Saturday, and sundry other offices, containing Hymns and Antiphons in her honour. These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them; and it has been the strong feeling that this is really the case, that has led the writer of these pages fearlessly and securely to admit the real excellencies, and to dwell upon the antiquity, of the Roman Ritual. He has felt that, since the Romanists required an unqualified assent to the whole of the Breviary, and that there were passages which no Anglican ever could admit, praise the true Catholic portion of it as much as he might, he did not in the slightest degree approximate to a recommendation of Romanism. But to return;—these Invocations and Services to the Blessed Virgin have been above enumerated, with a view of observing that, on the very face of them, they do not enter into the structure of the Breviary; they are really, as they are placed, additions, and might easily have been added at some late period, as (e. g.) was the case with our own Thanksgiving, or the Prayer for the Parliament.

"(2.) This remark seems to apply to all the intrinsically exceptionable Addresses in the Breviary; for as to the Confession at Prime and Compline, in which is introduced the name of the Blessed Virgin and other saints, this practice stands on a different ground. It is not a simple gratuitous Invocation made to them, but it is an address to Almighty God in His heavenly court, as surrounded by His Saints and Angels, answering to St. Paul's charge to Timothy, 'before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect angels,' and to Daniel and St. John's address to the Angels who were sent to them. The same may even be said of the Invocation 'Holy Mary and all Saints,' &c. in the Prime Service, which Gavanti describes as being of very great antiquity. These usages certainly *now* do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church, and so are a serious evil; but it is worth pointing out, that, as on the one hand they have more claim to be considered an integral part of the service: so, on the other, more can be said to-

wards their justification than for those addresses which are now especially under our consideration." (pp. 9, 10.)

Such is the "expressed disapprobation" which is pleaded in extenuation of the insertion of these idolatrous addresses, and which it is thought that I ought to have alluded to in the rapid notice of the subject taken in the "Essays." Having now placed the whole facts of the case before your readers, I beg leave to add one or two observations.

The main circumstance of the case, to which I entreat especial attention, is this:—

It is supposed, I believe, by those cursory readers with whom the objection originates, that I had quoted *all the idolatrous prayers* which occur in the 75th Number of the *Tracts;* and had not quoted the editor's condemnation of *those* prayers. Whereas I have done nothing of the kind. My reason for not quoting or alluding to the editor's disclaimer of certain addresses to the Virgin, was, that *I had not quoted or alluded to any of those addresses to which his disclaimer referred.*

The reader will now have the kindness to consider with attention the passage from the 75th Tract, given above. He will see that I have divided it, with good reason, into two paragraphs, or clauses. The *first* paragraph refers to certain Prayers to the Virgin, which are said to "carry with them their own plain condemnation;" and to be "passages which no Anglican ever could admit." Passing on, then, to p. 86 of the *Tract*, we find a marginal note ("This is one of the four Antiphons animadverted on, pp. 11 and 23"). The Antiphon itself, and Collect following, are these:

"Hail, Queen! mother of mercy, our life, sweetness, and hope, hail! We exiles cry to thee, the children of Eve. To thee we sigh with groans and weeping in this valley of tears. Come then, O our advocate, turn on us thy merciful eyes, and shew to us, after this banishment, Jesus, the blessed fruit of thy womb. O kind, O pitiful, O sweet Virgin Mary,

"Pray for us, holy mother of God,

"That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ.

"Almighty everlasting God, who hast prepared the body and soul of Mary the glorious Virgin Mother, to be a fit dwelling for Thy Son by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, grant that we, who are gladdened by this commemoration of her, may by her pitiful intercession be delivered from present ills, and eternal death, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

This Antiphon and Collect, then, thus distinctly disclaimed by the Editor of the Tract, I took care *not to quote against him* in the *Essays.*

So, at page 23, he gave four Antiphons of a like character, distinctly objecting to them, and declaring them to be "beyond the power of any defence." I therefore again cautiously abstained from laying any thing to his charge, on the score of their idolatrous character.

But now we must come to the *second* clause of his supposed disclaimer. He had already spoken of "all the intrinsically exceptionable addresses;" he now goes on to observe, that "as to the Confession at Prime and Compline, in which is introduced the name of the blessed Virgin and other saints, *this practice stands on a different ground.*" He proceeds to justify and support this Confession by references to Scripture, the most inapplicable that I have ever seen, and then adds, "The same may even be said of the Invocation 'Holy Mary and all Saints,' in the Prime Service, which Gavanti describes as being of *very great antiquity.*"

Now we must not forget that with these writers "very great antiquity" is almost tantamount to Divine Inspiration. They speak of "Revelation" as found alike "in Scripture *or Antiquity.*" (*British Critic*, Jan. 1838, p. 224.)

Here, then, I felt that I had a right to quote the Tract, as giving *these* Prayers with a degree of approbation. If the reader will refer back to the passage complained of in the "Essays," he will observe, that while I had carefully avoided charging the Editor with those idolatrous addresses which he had disclaimed, I did quote against him just those prayers to which the above passages refer.

Perhaps some one may ask, Why, if I alluded to the 75th Tract at all, I did not describe it more fully; stating, equally, what it admitted, and what it rejected, of these idolatrous Prayers. This might reasonably have been required of me, had I been professing to review or give a general account of that Tract; but I was doing no such thing. I was merely rapidly enumerating, under fourteen different heads, various instances of a tendency to Popery which had lately shewed themselves; and, in just *twenty-one* lines, I spoke of the Tract, No. 75. It was impossible for me to stop to describe, under each of these fourteen heads, the precise character and scope of each work quoted. All I could pretend to do, was to quote fairly. This I did in the case of Tract No. 75, by omitting entirely all reference to *those* Prayers to the Virgin which the Editor had *disclaimed;* and quoting *those only* which he declared to "stand on different ground," and to be *not* "intrinsically exceptionable."

This is my defence, as to the bare matter of fact. I plead *not guilty* to the charge of having "affirmed of the Editor" of the Tract that he had "approved" of any prayer, of which he had, in fact, "expressed his disapprobation."

But we must now look a little beyond the mere letter—the dry matter of fact—and see how the case stands as to the general accusation made in the *Essays*. My charge was, that in a book of Selections from the Breviary, prepared and recommended for Protestant use, the Editor had inserted idolatrous prayers to the Virgin and the Saints. Is this a true representation or not? I had stated it in the *Essays* in four lines; let me me now extend and establish it.

First, then, I observe, that the said Tract is, professedly, a *selection;* that is, a series or arrangement of Prayers taken out of the Roman Breviary, and in which the insertion of any one distinct Prayer is a purely *voluntary* act on the part of the Editor. There was not the least necessity for him to have inserted one single fragment of idol or saint worship. It is very well for him to talk of having given these prayers with a view to shew their history and their recent introduction; but his Tract is declared, at the very outset, to be, not a work of antiquarian research, but of pious utility; and with a view to that utility it was open to him to insert, or to omit, any prayer that he liked. Every line, therefore, that we find in the Tract, is there simply by his own *voluntary act of selection.*

Secondly, I would remark that not only is the work described as a "re-appropriation" of a "treasure lost through inadvertence;" but it is distinctly offered as a book for the use of private Christians. "It may suggest," we are told, "character and matter for our private devotions;" it is intended "to ground the reader in a course of daily worship as a whole." Nay, a *new service* for "Bishop Ken's day" is constructed to "suggest to individual Christians a means of carrying out in private the principle and spirit of those inestimable forms of devotion which are contained in our authorized Prayer-book." Thus throughout, the Tract is offered, not as a specimen of black-

letter lore; but as a book *for use*; and it is in this point of view that judgment must be passed upon it.

Looking at it, then, in this point of view, what are the passages of a clearly idolatrous character which are scattered up and down in it? We must keep clear, as before, of those Prayers which the Editor has disclaimed; and only ask, What are those to which he has affixed no mark of reprobation? Here are several such:—

"Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that we thy servants may ever prosper in perpetual health of body and mind, and by the *glorious intercession of the blessed Mary*, Ever Virgin, may be delivered from present sadness, and enjoy eternal bliss."

"Holy Mary, and all the saints intercede for us to the Lord, that we may be worthy of His help and salvation, who liveth and reigneth, world without end."

"Therefore, I beseech thee, Blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the Blessed John Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, All saints, and thee, my Father, to pray the Lord our God for me."

"Blessed Laurence, Martyr of Christ, intercede for us." (p. 125.)

"Let us keep Vigil on the Sabbath with the blessed Apostle Peter, *whose deeds of grace working together with our prayers*, we may obtain what we seek, through our Lord Jesus Christ." (p. 168.)

"May he whose festival we keep, (Laurence) intercede for us to the Lord." (p. 133.)

These acts of idolatry, be it remembered, are insidiously scattered up and down this book, which is expressly stated to be intended to "suggest matter for our private devotions;" and although a casual reader, glancing his eye over the introductory pages, may say, "Oh, these Prayers to the Virgin are distinctly disclaimed by the Editor," the actual student of the work will know better. *He* will know which are branded as "indefensible," and "of late introduction;" and which are inserted without any such exception, and "to ground the reader in a course of daily worship as a whole."

But, after all this manœuvring, first advancing, then retreating, then re-advancing a step, till it is difficult to tell on what ground the Editor really means to take his stand; does it never occur to him, that idolatry is *no light matter*: that if there be any one thing distinctly declared of God in the Holy Scriptures, it is that "*He will not give His glory to another*," nor tolerate the least dereliction, on this point, even in his otherwise faithful servants?

Yet here are six or seven solemn addresses scattered up and down this work, all of which offer the highest affront to God, and none of which are guarded by any mark of reprobation from the Editor. On this subject, a remark of Mr. Cuninghame's, in one of his works on Prophecy, forcibly occurs to my memory. He says,

"I believe, that *needlessly familiarizing* the mind with the abominations of heathen idolatry, has an effect on the heart analogous to that upon the imagination from the perusal of obscene books, or the view of obscene prints. And I cannot but lament that the pages of a work on the sacred subject of prophecy should be *polluted* by such a prayer, with no other notice of it than that it is curious. Paul would have wept at the recollection of the creatures of God ruined and undone by this work of Satan." (Cuninghame's Crit. Examin. p. 155.)

I shall quit the subject with only one further remark, namely, that the Prayers in question, (I again speak *only* of those *not excepted against* by the editor of the Tract) appear to me to offer an insult to the Divine Majesty in two leading particulars:

1. They ascribe to Mary, to Laurence, and to various other departed men and women, the incommunicable attributes of God, omnipresence and omniscience. It is one of the peculiar titles of God, used by the

Psalmist, "*O thou that* HEAREST PRAYER:" and nothing, surely, can be more offensive in His eyes, or more grievous to the mind of a true worshipper, than this senseless and blasphemous transfer of such a title to a number of poor human creatures like ourselves.

2. They equally insult the "ONE MEDIATOR *between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus.*" What does the sinner want with, or where could he find, a better mediator than HIM who died on the cross for man's salvation? The Papists themselves offer, indeed, one justification for the invention of a variety of intercessors. "Mary and the saints," they tell us, "will be *more attentive* to our cries, and *more sympathizing* with our necessities, than Christ himself!" But is not this insult to the Saviour, just the most dreadful feature in the whole Roman system? Protestants, surely, cannot *yet* be brought to bear even the suggestion of such an argument.

Enough, however, of these abominations! So far from having any thing to recal, or to moderate, I have rather to apologize for having so rapidly passed over these awful instances of defection from the worship of God. And I must add, further, that it does appear somewhat strange, that while Bishops themselves are called to account for an apparent patronage of heresy, scarcely any notice has been taken of this instance, not of seeming patronage merely, but of positive, open inculcation of downright idolatry.

Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and Mr. Keble, have all subscribed the xxxvth Article, which recognizes and adopts the doctrine of the Homily on Prayer, expressly naming it, as "containing a godly and wholesome doctrine." Now that Homily has these words:

"The first condition is this, that he, to whom we make our prayers, be able to help us. The second is, that he will help us. The third is, that he be such a one as may hear our prayers. The fourth is, that he understand better than we ourselves what we lack, and how far we have need of help. If these things be to be found in any other saving only God, then may we lawfully call upon some other besides God. But what man is so gross, but he well understandeth that these things are only proper to him which is omnipotent, and knoweth all things, even the very secrets of the heart? that is to say, only and to God alone; whereof it followeth, that we must call neither upon an angel, nor yet upon saint, but only and solely upon God, as St. Paul doth write: 'How shall men call upon him in whom they have not believed?' Rom. x. So that invocation or prayer may not be made without faith in him on whom they call; but that we must first believe in him, before we can make our prayer unto him, whereupon we must only and solely pray unto God. For to say that we should believe either in angel or saint, or in any other living creature, were most horrible blasphemy against God and his holy word; neither ought this fancy to enter into the heart of any Christian man, because we are expressly taught in the word of the Lord only to repose our faith in the blessed Trinity, in whose only name we are also baptized, according to the express commandment of our Saviour Jesus Christ, in the last of St. Matthew. *Matt.* xxviii."

"Is there any angel, any virgin, any patriarch or prophet among the dead, that can understand or know the meaning of the heart? The Scripture saith, It is God that searcheth the heart and the reins, and that he only knoweth the hearts of the children of men. *Psalm* vii. *Apoc.* ii. *Jer.* xvii. 2 *Chron.* vi. As for the saints, they have so little knowledge of the secrets of the heart, that many of the ancient Fathers greatly doubt whether they know any thing at all, that is commonly done on earth. And albeit some think they do, yet St. Augustine, a doctor of great authority and also antiquity, hath this opinion of them; that they know no more what we do on earth, than we know what they do in heaven."

"And if it be so, that we need one to entreat for us, why may we not content ourselves with that one mediator, which is at the right hand of God the Father, and there liveth for ever to make intercession for us? *Heb.* vii. As the blood of Christ did redeem us on the cross, and cleanse us from our sins; even so it is now able to save all them that come unto God by it. For Christ, sitting in heaven, hath an everlasting priesthood, and always prayeth to his Father for them

that be penitent, obtaining by virtue of his wounds, which are evermore in the sight of God, not only perfect remission of our sins, but also all other necessaries that we lack in this world; so that this only Mediator is sufficient in heaven, and needeth no others to help him."

"But that we should pray unto saints, neither have we any commandment in all the Scripture, nor yet example which we may safely follow. So that being done without authority of God's word, it lacketh the ground of faith, and therefore cannot be acceptable before God."

To all this have the Oxford Tract writers solemnly subscribed their names, as being "a godly and wholesome doctrine;" and after this, they deliberately publish, "to suggest *character and matter* for our private devotion," prayers to the Virgin, to St. Laurence, to St. John the Baptist, and divers others; and they do all this coolly, without shame, and, thus far, without rebuke! But where is all this to end?

In conclusion, Sir, I would join in your protest against the "stealthiness" of these writers. Not only with reference to No. 75 of the *Tracts*, but also in the case of another of their works, *Froude's Remains*, is the same system of subterfuge and bush-fighting adopted. They publish "the Remains" of a friend. Of course this work is not a complete collection of every scrap of paper which the said friend, Mr. Froude, had left behind him. They had exercised an editorial judgment, and had *selected* such writings as they conceived likely to do honour to his memory, good to the world, and no injury to their own characters.

Does any one suppose that if a stray sentence savouring of heresy, as of Socinianism for instance, had been found,—that sentence would have been printed, and printed without the annexation of a protest by the editors? Yet when we quote passage after passage from Froude, declaring, not once, but some scores of times, his hatred of the Reformation and the Reformers, we are immediately told that it is not fair to lay these opinions to the charge of Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble.

We demand in reply, Why, if these are *not* their opinions, did they publish all these sayings, without one word disavowing their own personal participation in such sentiments?

This sort of conduct has not been customary among English theologians. Who ever imagined such a thing to be possible, as for Richard Hooker, or Robert Leighton, or Thomas Scott, or even Samuel Horsley, to write, *purposely*, in such a way as to leave it a matter of doubt what it was that they really meant to advance?

Yet this is the settled system, deliberately adopted, of these resuscitators of Romanism. Their whole plan of action is altogether *strategical*. Suddenly we find a broad and flagrant piece of Popery among us. Attention is excited, an inquiry takes place, and the putative father is called to an account. But he declares it to be none of his; and after a little stir, the matter dies away. Anon, we have a second; and then the same course is to be gone through. But where is the least vestige of Christian simplicity all this while? Some likeness, indeed, to the shifting and windings of Arius and his associates there may be; but the only appropriate modern name for this sort of policy, is JESUITISM. I remain, Sir, &c.

THE AUTHOR OF THE
"ESSAYS ON THE CHURCH."

OUR MOST RELIGIOUS AND GRACIOUS QUEEN.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE distinction which you mention between the personal and the official character of the sovereign, in reference to the epithets "most religious and gracious," may, I think, be illustrated by many of our public formulæ of salutation. I have seen a document addressed by the sovereign officially to one of his subjects as "right trusty and well-beloved;" though the sovereign personally had a strong prejudice against the individual addressed. There was no deception in the case; for while an individual retains an office, he must be considered publicly entitled to the epithets which belong to it. At the same time I concur with you that "it were to be wished that the passage were so worded as to prevent misconception."

N. G.

"THE REDEMPTION OF THE FIRST-BORN."

(NUMBERS XVIII. 16.)

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I AM anxious to draw the attention of Christian parents to that beautiful subject, "the redemption of the first-born," under the Jewish law, and to enforce its practice under the Christian law of love.

The seed of Abraham were forcibly taught of God, in every act of dedication or consecration, the doctrine of the atonement. In "the redemption of the first-born" they were reminded practically, rather than by description, of the necessity of a redemption price being paid. The dedication was also strikingly typical of Christ, "the first begotten of his Father," who gave himself a redemption price "to bring many sons unto glory.' I would venture to extend this long forgotten obligation, and recommend the adoption of this divinely instituted act, under the present dispensation, as that of a *thank-offering;* urging, as a motive in Christian parents, the noble purpose to which their obligation may be sanctified, to spread the knowledge of redemption to those lands which have never yet heard "the joyful sound." Christian parents must not forget, when the charge of an immortal soul is committed to them, how important it is *early* to attract the powers of the mind to the subject of religion.

The plan I would propose, is, that every first-born be redeemed, and that parents "shall do it according to their estimation." Let them present this offering in faith and prayer, and I cannot but believe they may fairly build upon it a confidence that *when their child* arrives at an age of accountability, that Gospel, which their redemption, oblation, or thank-offering, was devoted to spread, will, through the influences of the Holy Spirit, and in answer to prayer, be brought home to the heart of their child. The adoption of this plan might also be made the means of bringing the attention of the child to bear on the interests of religion, when instructed that at its birth an offering was made in its behalf by its parents; and at that early period of its existence, its name stood on the Missionary or Bible Report, ranked amongst its friends and supporters. The redemption pledge of its parents must also ever appear to it an earnest of the deep interest

they felt for the salvation of the soul of their child, designed by them to shadow forth a redemption more precious than of gold or silver—a redemption received and enjoyed—a redemption saving in its influences, and in its germinating effects fruitful; leading the soul up to its Redeemer's throne, there to receive that crown of redemption, "the crown of life," promised to the faithful first-born, whose names are written in heaven.

C. W.

*** To devote a thank-offering to God, for some pious object, upon the birth of the eldest child, as proposed by our correspondent, and as has been carried into effect by many Christian parents, is a very excellent suggestion; and we should be glad to see it extensively acted upon; and why not also upon the birth of every child, as well as the first-born, so far as circumstances allow? But our only reason for adding a note, is to remark, that under the Gospel dispensation we have already a special and divinely appointed dedication in the sacrament of baptism; and with this, rather than with a free-will birth-day offering of worldly substance, will the believing parent connect, and teach his child to connect, the beneficial effects pointed out by our correspondent. We live in an age of machinery; and are too apt to expect to achieve, by some new application of power, what we might better hope for in a right and adequate direction of the old. If God's own ordinance of Baptism, with all its solemnities and hallowed vows, do not move the minds of our children in after years, we do not augur much from their name having been enrolled in a Missionary Report; though the two are quite compatible; thanksgiving offerings are peculiarly congenial, either to birth or baptismal dedication. This explanation was not necessary for our readers or our correspondent: but it may save some objector the trouble of repeating the oft-heard but absurd aspersion, that the friends of Missionary and Bible Societies seem to think more of "will-worship" than of divine institutions.

ON INJUDICIOUS ANECDOTES IN TRACTS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I AM no lover of fault-finding, much less of fault-making, but I have been so much grieved, as have many of my reverend brethren, in reading some of the anecdotes which are circulated in popular religious tracts, that I feel constrained to remonstrate. The topic, I know, has been alluded to in your pages, but the remonstrance requires to be reiterated, for the evil "has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." The heaps of worse than trash which are often piled up together under the name of "religious anecdotes" are most mischievous; and should be set fire to—I do not say by the hangman—but by every judicious parent, master, tutor, Sunday-school teacher, and pastor.

One example may serve as a specimen. In a publication which is being widely circulated at Cheltenham, entitled "A Refutation of Astrology," I find the following story, which the author, with the best possible intention, gives as an extract from "Anecdotes published by the Religious Tract Society, page 155."

"A shepherd boy, some years ago, in Scotland, was present at the parochial catechising, and was asked, Who tempted our first parents to sin? His answer was, '*The De'il, sir.*' Then came the question, How did the Devil learn to sin?

He had never thought of this before, and for a time was somewhat *nonplussed*, but though conscious of ignorance did not like to plead it. At length he said, with great appearance of triumph, "*I have it noo! The De'il must have taken up sinning as my brother Jock did the tailor trade—at his ain hand, and no' by learning frae anither.*' This is the substance of all that has been written on the origin of evil; the whole 'Iliad of the question in a nutshell.'"

Permit a few remarks upon this "religious" anecdote.

The first is, that it bears every mark of being fabricated, that is, forged, as do not a few of the Religious Tract Society's smart anecdotes, for which the compilers give no authority or reference. They are a sort of regularly cut and dried "religious" "Joe Millers." It is not very likely that at a Scottish "parochial catechising," a boy would have dared, and "with great appearance of triumph," to make such a flippant speech about the devil's conduct being like his brother Jock taking to the tailor trade; and it is still less likely that the pastor, instead of repressing the laugh which such a sally must have excited, should have treasured up the triumphant speech as too good to be lost, and well deserving to be stereotyped for the use of a Religious Tract Society. The suspiciously vague "some years ago," which is the favourite date of so many of these "religious anecdotes," is one among many internal evidences of fabrication.

But even supposing the anecdote were authentic, I am as much "nonplussed" to discover its pertinency, as the boy was to solve the problem of the origin of moral evil. The Tract Society says that the Iliad of this solemn question, which has hitherto perplexed all who have tried to explain it, is contained in this nutshell; though I confess I could neither crack the shell, nor even when it is opened ready to my hands by the Society's nutcracker, can I discover any kernel in it. In deep seriousness, I would ask what information or useful illustration towards the solution of the inquiry—a somewhat presumptuous inquiry at best—why God permitted sin to enter his creation, is contained in the statement that Satan "took up sinning of his own accord, and not by learning it of another." There must have been an originator somewhere; and the inspired volume traces up the primal criminality to the angels who kept not their first estate; and assuredly in no "parochial school" was it ever asked who taught Satan to sin, except it might be merely to elicit the obvious Scriptural answer, "No one; certainly not God;" without affecting to suppose that in this answer there is couched any new discovery. The chain is shifted one link back; but what upholds *that* link? the Indian rests the earth on the elephant, and the elephant on the tortoise; but what supports the tortoise? The question appears to be fabricated only for the sake of the witticism of Satan's taking to sin, as brother Jock did to the tailor trade, of his own hand.

But still further; even if the story were true, and the illustration striking, the anecdote would be exceptionable from its character and spirit. The pretended fact is not related with serious gravity; it is made as jocose as possible; the writer, like Pope's "gentle dulness," "loves a joke;" his "nonplussed" and the Iliad in a nutshell are evidently intended to be facetious; and to make the whole the more ludicrous, the laugh-provoking Scotticisms of Burns and Sir Walter Scott are humbly imitated; and "the devil" is called "the De'il;" and to heighten the drollery, he is compared to a tailor; and "sinning" is made a very *funny* thing, by telling of Satan's "taking it up" as a man takes up the trade of botching clothes without

having been apprenticed to it. And then when the joke is ended, and the laugh has gone round, the narrator puts on a grave air, and affects to have related the tale, because it contained the Iliad of the Scriptural disclosures respecting the fall of Satan and of man, in a nutshell. This very remark, if there be truth in internal evidence, proves that he was aware that he was writing lightly upon a subject too solemn for lightness; but that he could not repress so good a jest. So have I seen a frivolous young man, in a company of seriously-minded persons, put forth some idle and improper tale; and when he expected to be greeted by an approving smile, but found in its place a reproving silence, he tried to turn off the reproach by a set speech about the important moral which he designed to impress. But did they believe him? Now I *do* believe the Tract Society's compiler. I think he honestly sees some good point in the story—which I do not; but I think also that he was amused by its smartness; and that, lest serious people should take offence at the latter, sooner than repress the whole he laboured with all his might to elaborate the former.

NUCIFRANGIBULUM.

*** We have several times asked the conductors of the Religious Tract Society to shew us their authority for some of their wonderful stories, such as those of barbers on the verge of insolvency coming into large fortunes by refusing to shave some traveller on a Sunday; and some also of their witty ones, such as the above; but none of their defenders, either in our pages or elsewhere, have complied with this very reasonable request. These stories are offensive, both from taste and upon principle, to the clergy, and to well-educated lay members of the Church of England; but there is in some quarters a strong predilection for a sort of low humour fit only for "Jock the tailor," and which is not merely repulsive, but almost profane, when ludicrously blended with infinitely solemn subjects, such as that of the fall of the apostate angels, through whose fall eventually came ours. We pity the Sunday-school teacher who can enjoy the facetiousness of telling his little pupils, from the Religious Tract Society's manual, that "the de'il took up sinning as brother Jock did the tailor trade." We have known the local meetings of religious societies (the large public meetings are usually better conducted) rendered nauseous by the joking strain in which some dissenting ministers retail stories of this kind, which are pointless as wit, and futile as argument; which have neither Attic nor Christian salt in them (Matt. v. 13), and are fit only "to be cast out and trodden under foot."*

---

* We can assure our readers, in all sincerity, that after writing the above sentence, we fully intended to cross it out before we sent our paper to press; not because it is not true, but lest it should be deemed offensive; but happening, the very next day, to take up, quite accidently, a publication written in 1835, entitled "A national church vindicated, in refutation of a petition from the Dissenters of Glasgow to Earl Grey," we observed some illustrations of our statement which made us conclude not to suppress it; more especially as it must be the wish of every seriously minded Dissenter, as much as of churchmen, to check the introduction of coarse humour and light irreverent allusions to Scripture at all times, but emphatically in books, tracts, and addresses professing to be 'religious.' The writer of the remarks on the Glasgow Petition (speaking of a meeting of the 'Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society' held at 'Finsbury Chapel, Moorfields,' at which, though in a place professing to be dedicated to the worship of God, much unhallowed railing was uttered,) quotes the following among other specimens of the coarse and irreverent effusions to which we allude:

"H. Thompson, Esq. of Islington, Cash Secretary to the Society, begins by

LETTER TO A FRIEND RESPECTING BECOMING SPONSOR FOR HIS CHILD.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE following brief letter, written in friendship, not controversy, in reply to an application to become sponsor for a child, is respectfully submitted to your readers, in the hope it may suggest a few particulars not uninteresting to some of them.

EUSEBIUS.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Most true it is, as you say, that upon so important a matter as becoming sponsor for your dear infant, which will be a great pleasure to me, we should rightly understand each other's views respecting the sacrament of baptism. You remark that your opinions have "ripened" of late; mine I confess are what they have been these many years.

I have implicit faith in the promises of God. When I read, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he shall not depart from it;" I fully believe the declaration, though when I read

---

telling us that 'he felt that

'The time was come when they must not
Keep silence but speak out...
On such a theme 'twas impious to be calm,
Passion is temper, transport reason here.'"

The first two lines are an irreverent parody upon the third verse of the fifteenth psalm, in its antique versification:

Our God shall come: and he will not
Keep silence, but speak out.

Of the application of the other two lines, "On such a theme, &c." we say less, as the lines are not the word of God; though it is not very seemly to apply to "temporal endowments, tithes, glebes, church-rates, and surplice fees," (for these were the themes on which the orator was expatiating) language which the poet used in reference to "the agony and bloody sweat, the cross and passion," of our divine Lord. We do not see that if the speaker had been more "calm," and less in a "passion," while expressing his dislike to pay his taxes and fees, he could have been reasonably called "impious." But we must go on with our intended quotation:

"Another, Mr. Brown, of Wareham, in moving the adoption of the Report at the above-mentioned meeting, said, he had been advised to keep his temper, but he generally found, that those who felt deeply would speak strongly; for

When the castigated pulse goes wallop,
How hard it is to stop the gallop!

"This is not very refined, although cheered by the good taste of the meeting; nor does it lead us to expect much refinement in what may follow."

"'He fancied he was walking in the purlieus of Newgate, when he saw a monster without ears, shaped like a man, and crawling like a serpent. A personage having a black apron in front, and on his head what Milton calls an inverted mis-shapen hoof, approached the monster, and addressing him, said, 'Mr. Perjury, how do you do?' and procured him quarters in the Episcopal Palace.'"

Take three other instances of light or jocose allusion to Scripture from the same pages:—

"Another of these rhapsodists, in a wise speech at Manchester, tells us, 'That Nebuchadnezzar was the golden head of the then established religion, and among the first Dissenters were the three famous youths, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego!'"

"'Whenever two or three are gathered together, not according to act of parliament, but in my name, there am I in the midst of them, and that to bless them.'"

"Another Rev. Gentlemen (vide Speech of the Rev. Mr. Thurrell, at a meeting for conference between the united committee appointed to obtain the redress of grievances of Dissenters, and deputies from various parts of the country,) says, 'Even in the presence of sovereigns, my cry should be,—

also that good men may beget wicked sons; and I see in fact that the children of the wicked may be brought to the knowledge and obedience of Christ, and the children of righteous ones may never arrive at it; I cannot so construe the promise as to be inconsistent with this Scriptural assertion, and these undeniable facts. It may be replied, that the degenerate children of the righteous were *not* trained in the way in which they should go;

Down with the Church of England, let it be brought to the ground!'"

We shall offend no Dissenter, whose censure is of any weight, by thus recording our protest against this evil practice of flippant allusion to sacred things. We equally reprobate the practice, when churchmen are guilty of it.

As the famous Glasgow dissenting petition happens to be in our hands, we will refer to a single passage in it, in proof of what we have so often asserted of the inconsistency and injustice of the evangelical Dissenters, in attempting to abolish church rates and the national church, on the ground that no person ought to be made to pay tax or rate for any religious object which he may say he does not approve of; and yet when the Jew, the Roman Catholic, the Deist, the Atheist, and that representative of them all, the Central Education Society, apply this rule to the proposed Lancastrian plan of education, to reject their claims, and to insist that all classes of persons shall pay for the introduction of the system proposed in Lord Brougham's bill, into every parish in the kingdom, whether they like it or not; for churchmen must pay rates for it, though they disapprove of it, as professing to give religious instruction, by introducing the Scriptures, and yet allowing the master who is to expound them to be a Jew, Papist, infidel, or heretic; while these latter also must pay for it, though they declare that it involves the principle of an established church; and that they can quite as conscientiously pay church-rates as school-rates, if the schools are to make religious instruction *in any form* any portion of their system; and that they have quite as much scruple in aiding a Lancastrian school as a Bell one. Would you then have a national system of Atheistical education? says the Evangelical Dissenter. Your own principles bring us to it, is the obvious reply, so far as regards legislation, (vide the Marriage Act;) and no Dissenter has yet undertaken to shew where we are to stop short of that point; or how a Sabbath is to be nationally upheld, or the Bible nationally introduced into schools, except upon the tacit admission of the right and duty of the legislature to consult the religious welfare of the people. We will interlard the few lines which we are about to quote with the parallel case of Roman Catholics, Jews, and others. We might add the grievance to churchmen also, as they must pay rates, though they may not have their own system; but we specify Jews and Roman Catholics, because it is against their principles to admit the Bible as a school book.

"The special grievances of which the Scottish Dissenters [*of which Roman Catholics, Jews, and others*] have to complain, and for the redress of which they desire the influence of your Lordship, and your Lordship's colleagues, are these:—They are compelled to contribute to the erection and repairs of edifices [*school-houses*], in which they do not worship [allow their children to be instructed]; to the payment of ministers of religion [*school-masters*] from whose services they derive no advantage; and to the support of a system, from many parts of which they conscientiously dissent. Many of their members are harassed and injured by processes at law, to which the buildings of churches [*school-houses*], or the augmentations of the salary of incumbents [*school-masters*], frequently and unavoidably give occasion. In consequence of the subjection of parochial education [*for which they are obliged to pay parish rates*] to the Local Ecclesiastical authorities [*to the system of Lord Brougham and the Evangelical Dissenters*], they are excluded, not indeed from the seminaries for the instruction of their youth, [*that is, if they choose to violate their consciences*] but from the place of teachers in the 930 [*blank*] parishes of Scotland [*Great Britain*], as they are virtually from professorships in the colleges, [*seeing that they must be expected to read and explain the Bible with their pupils.*]"

Now we do not mean that there is not a very solid reply to these interpolated arguments; but it equally applies to the genuine text.

and in truth no child of a fallen though regenerated parent is perfectly so trained; but still, to all appearance, some who did ill were quite as well trained as some who did well.

Again, I have a very enlarged view of the value of the intercessional prayer of faith: and I can have no doubt that He who made the soul can renew it when and how it pleases him; or that he can, and often may, and perhaps does, justify and sanctify an infant either from its natural birth or from its baptism; but faith must have the basis of Scripture to rest upon; and I am not acquainted with any passage which even *seems* to contradict the general doctrine taught in the 18th chapter of Ezekiel; or the repeated declarations that it was not the outward rite of circumcision which availed, but being a new creature; or that says that every baptized infant is justified; or that imputes the vicarious faith of the church for justification.

It is not asserted by any one that all baptized persons really grow up in the faith and love of Christ. But it is said, that if not, they must have departed from their baptismal purity; they must have lost their regeneration; they were once children of God, but they have gone back to Satan. I say nothing of the hypothetical cast of this argument; except that I cannot perceive that it rests upon any warranty of Holy Scripture. I have heard the matter put somewhat as follows:—All infants are born in sin, and children of wrath: the unbaptized continue so, unless God shall in future years bring them to repentance and faith, when they will desire to be baptized, and thereby become regenerate: whereas, those who were baptized were renewed in virtue of the vicarious faith of the church; and though God knows that many of them will not grow up in the faith, yet he says, as it were, "I adopt you temporally as my children for the sake of others; I honour and reward the faith of my church; I give you a nature more resembling an angelic nature than anything earthly; this nature will never shew itself, and it will become ultimately overlaid and extinguished; you will not know that you once had it; but nevertheless I have given it to you, and the crime and guilt are your own, if you do not keep it." Of this argument also, I will only say, that I cannot discern anything in the word of God to bear out such a system. When I have requested friends to shew me the plain text of Scripture as their warrant for these declarations, they have referred me only to human writings.

Still further, I most heartily join in the vows, pledges, prayers, and declarations in our church service. The tenour of them is evidently derived from the circumstances of the baptism of a believing adult; and I consider them as used according to the explanation given in the catechism, that infants are baptized, because though they cannot exercise repentance and faith, they promise them by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform. This view, which was formerly satisfactory to your mind, is satisfactory to mine still. I consider the Zuinglian school quite wrong in making baptism (if they do so make it, and are not falsely accused) *only* the dedication of the child to God by its parents; it is also the visible sign of *the child's dedication of itself to God;* and this being supposed, the gift of the inward and spiritual grace is predicated. In point of argument I lay down these distinctions strongly; I believe them to be Scriptural; and I think them of great importance to be clearly understood, in order that baptism may not be made "a refuge of lies," as too

often it is, both in the church of Rome, and I fear among ourselves; for many who have utterly neglected the vows of baptism, are too apt ignorantly to hope for some saving benefit from its reception. But though in argument I speak thus strongly; and though when I think of the actual character of millions of baptized persons, the probabilities, humanly speaking, are strongly against indulging confidence in any particular case; yet when I surround with my fellow Christians the font of baptism, I seem to cherish no doubt, but rather earnestly believe, that what we have prayed for in faith, will be fulfilled; and that the Lamb's book of life will at the last day reveal upon its pages that name (so to speak) which we have been recording in the earthly register of baptism.

I have thus put you briefly in possession of my views and feelings upon this interesting occasion; and however much they may differ from those which you account more "ripened," be assured that none will desire to pray with more affection and earnestness, whether at the font or elsewhere, for your babe, that he may be "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," than your ever affectionate friend, —— ——

VINDICATION OF THE MODERN IMPRESSIONS OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE testimony contained in your Number for November, from our fellow Christians of the United States, not only to the generally acknowledged excellence of the English version, but to the accuracy of our modern impressions, and their great superiority over the original edition of 1611, must have given much satisfaction to many of your readers, more especially if any of them perused the objections brought forward some time since by Mr. Curtis and others. I can add the result of my own examination to what you state, of the great improvement in the italic notifications. The complaint of the objectors was, that the modern italics often mark as *not* in the original, what verbally or substantially *is* in the original, and, therefore, displace a portion of what the Holy Spirit indited. But the real fact is just the other way; namely, that the omission of italics in many places in the edition of 1611 foists into the inspired text what does not belong to it. The translators may not in some places have duly made the distinction in their manuscripts; and in others the press may have been in fault; indeed it was impossible that in *a first edition*, of a very large volume, printed from numerous manuscripts, (each writer varying a little from others in his typographical notifications) and necessarily committed to various compositors, readers, and editors, there should be complete uniformity. This could only be attained by subsequent careful revisions, under one superintending mind, with the whole printed copy open for minute collation. It is surprising, and shews the great care of the translators, transcribers, and correctors of the press, that there should have been upon the whole so admirably excellent an *editio princeps*; but to say that there are no mistakes or anomalies would neither be true nor credible.

I was led to address you on the subject by observing yesterday, in

my daily course of reading, one of these italic discrepancies which I have never seen noticed. In the account given in the eighth chapter of St. John, of the woman who was taken before our Lord by the Scribes and Pharisees, we read at verse 6 in our authorized version, that "Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not.*" The words in italics are so printed in our modern Bibles; but in the edition of 1611 they are printed without any typographical distinction, and are thus made a part of the inspired text. Now I do not think they ought to be admitted *even with the italics,* for they are a comment and not a translation; and I, for one, think a mistaken comment. I do not believe that our Lord pretended not to hear them; I conceive rather that his whole gesture, as well as what he wrote, (whatever it might be) were intended to say that he knew and attended to what they were saying; and it seems to me probable, from the context, that there was a reference to the injunctions of the Mosaic law in similar cases.

Observe the circumstances. The Saviour was sitting in the temple, teaching the people as one having authority. Now a woman, under suspicion of adultery, was by the Mosaic law to be brought "before the Lord," in the tabernacle, and the priest was, among other ceremonies, to "take of the dust of the floor of the tabernacle;" and also to address the woman, and to write the denounced "curses." The Scribes and Pharisees brought this woman into the temple before the Lord; of her criminality there was no question; they therefore told our Lord, that by the law of Moses she ought to be stoned; but they asked what was his decision on the subject, hoping to find matter of accusation against him; for if he acquitted the woman, it would be said that he contravened the law of Moses, and he would be exposed to the rage of the people; if he pronounced sentence upon her, and still more, if the people in consequence stoned her, he would be amenable to the Romans, who forbad any Jewish tribunal to pronounce capital punishment. They also treated him ironically as a priest; and jeeringly as an unauthorised innovator; "Moses said thus;—what sayest thou?"

Our Lord hereupon "stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground." I think this was clearly in allusion to the priest stooping down to take up some of the dust; and also writing the denounced "curses." What he wrote, it were vain to conjecture; it could not well be a long sentence, or many sentences; it might be merely some significant reference to the law of Moses as concerned themselves. He neither accepted nor declined the office of judge; he therefore gave them no opportunity of accusing him either to the people or to the Romans; but tacitly he intimated that he knew their hearts and lives; and that if they appealed to the law of Moses, and to Him as its expounder, they must abide by the consequences; for it was commanded that the accuser should cast the first stone; and if any one of them was guiltless let him do so, but abide by the consequences. They could not stand such an ordeal, and therefore went out confounded, perceiving that he knew what was in their thoughts. As for the woman, he neither condemned nor acquitted her judicially; he merely asked if there was any accuser, and none being there the accusation fell to the ground; yet at the same time, though he did not condemn her judicially, which was not his office, he addressed her in his office

as a spiritual instructor, with a solemn warning and injunction to sin no more.

I am far from pressing this interpretation, though I think it highly probable. All that I meant was to shew that the words "as though he heard them not," are merely a comment, and therefore, if admitted at all, ought to be printed in italics, as they are in modern editions, but were *not* in that of 1611.

The above reading, however, I ought not to fail to add, touches upon a wider question. There is nothing corresponding to the words "as though he heard them not," in the current Greek text, or in any credible manuscript, or in the Latin Vulgate, or in the translation of Beza, or the Geneva Bible, or in the translation of Tyndal, or in short in any one of some twenty texts and translations which I have referred to, except our authorised English one; nor does any annotator, that I am aware of, specifically comment on these words as a part of the inspired narrative. Yet, as in some Greek manuscripts this unauthenticated clause has been found, our translators have inserted a translation of it. Now if they did so, as meaning to say that it is a portion of the text, I am yet to learn on what shadow of authority they grounded their decision; but if they only considered it as a useful supplement, in order to shew the meaning of the passage, then it becomes a comment, and ought to have been in italics; as in the addition 1 John ii. 23, "but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." The result is, that if King James's translators only used the words as a gloss, but casually omitted the italics, then the modern impressions do no more than correct an error of the scribe or of the press; but if the translators *purposely* omitted the italics, they thereby included the words in the inspired text, and the modern version by using italics has appealed, from what King James's translators considered the true reading, to another, which, whether true or not, is not the reading adopted by our authorised translators.

BIBLICUS.

ON THE DANGERS OF RE-ACTION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE not forgotten the oft-repeated warning in your pages upon the dangers of re-action, and I hope to profit by it. It were grievous, indeed, if the exaggerated statements of certain divines respecting Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the Apostolical succession, and the writings and practices of holy men in former days, should cause us to disparage or undervalue any of those things, according to their true and scriptural purport.

But there is another class of matters of which I am reminded by the remarks in your November Number, respecting "Portable Chalices and Patens," and upon which I should be glad to have the opinion of some of your judicious correspondents. There are various observances not recognised by our church, but silently handed down from the days of Popery, which, not being things of any apparent moment, excited till lately no particular scruple in the minds of the great majority of churchmen; but to which a significative meaning being now attached by those writers who refer us to history as their exponents, offend many consciences.

I will mention two or three. It is customary to turn towards the East when the creeds are recited; our church gives no such direction: ought we then to do so, when by that ceremonial we are declared to embody the unscriptural fancies which Wheatley and others tell us it symbolises? Again, we place lighted candles on the communion table in college chapels and cathedrals on the eve of Saints' Days. Now Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and other canonists, affirm that this burning of candles is, and was meant to be, "a direct consumptive sacrifice." We intend not this by it; nay even the Oxford Tracts, in answer to the question whether we ought to worship saints, put the counter question, "Is it not safest not to pay them this extraordinary honour?" But since superstition is reviving, and various old customs, the purport of which had been forgotten, are being appealed to as emblematical, is it right to continue one so improper in itself, and so directly and decidedly forbidden and denounced in the Homily on the "Peril of Idolatry?" The custom could only have been kept up after the Reformation by thoughtless habit, or in contumacious defiance of the Church of England.

Again: many of us have been accustomed in cathedrals and college chapels to bow on going out, as the peasantry do in parish churches. I, for one, never attached any superstitious association to this; for I well remembered that the Convocation which met in the sixteenth year of Charles the Second, and which enjoined "doing reverence" at going in and out of churches, expressly said, that it was not in order "to exhibit any religious worship to the communion table, the East, or church, or any thing therein contained;" or "in celebration of the Holy Eucharist;" but only "for the advancement of God's majesty, and to give him that honour and glory that is due unto him." I therefore "did reverence" to God: but since Dr. Pusey says expressly that the obeisance is made "to the altar," and this in connection with the anti-Protestant notion of an actual sacrifice and the Real Presence, I do not think I can in future account it an indifferent action. It is one of those observances which, though kept up by custom, was silently, but I doubt not significantly, expunged from the Anglican service-book.

Other illustrations occur to me, but these may suffice. We need much wisdom and grace, in times like these, not to be led away either to the right hand or the left. AN OLD GOWNSMAN.

POETRY.

THE BABE OF BETHLEHEM. (FOR CHRISTMAS.)

NEARLY two thousand years ago,
A gentle babe was born;
Of parent poor, in birth-place low,
His birth-right want and scorn.

Yet of earth's myriads never one
Hath caused such hopes or fears;
Of all the hosts of angels,—none
Such triumphs, or such tears.

For on that lowly infant's birth,
That child of poverty,
Rested the destinies of earth,
Time and Eternity.

And quenchless love, and deathless hate,
Glory and shame unknown,
Have mark'd that child, so desolate,
True heir of heaven's high throne.

That child was born th' extremes to know
Of agony and love,
Beyond all human hearts below,
Or seraph-flames above;—
Was born to droop, with visage marr'd,
Bruis'd by th' avenging rod;
To sink with anguish, scourg'd and scarr'd,
Disown'd of man and God!
He sank in darkness, death, and shame,
Forsaken and accurst!
He rose,—with name o'er every name,—
The fairest and the first.
Now flames around that thorn-pierc'd brow
Th' eternal diadem;
And to *His* name all worlds shall bow,
Jesus of Bethlehem!
That name attunes the noblest lays
Of all the choirs above;
That name hath won a sweeter praise,
The ransom'd sinner's love!
Then plaintive lute awake, and tell
What mean the pain and fear;—
The wrath of heaven, the rage of hell,
The cross, the nail, the spear!
Wake harp and voice, with rapture tell
The mystery of grace;—
They sound not!—love and wonder swell
The heart with speechless praise!

F. M. S.

THE FADING YEAR. (THE RESURRECTION.)

How dark and drear the winter of the tomb
To unenlightened man; yet Faith's calm eye
Can view the bodies of the saints that lie
In the dark lap of earth, as plants whose bloom
Fades with the year; that share the common doom
Of all in this frail world, and seem to die;
Yet still the root survives, and fair and high,
Leaflet and blossom shall their form resume,
And nobler spring-tide greet the slumbering just;
Thy dead shall live, O Christ! with thee shall rise.
Awake and sing, ye dwellers in the dust,
Your dew is as the dew of herbs, when skies
Drop down with blessings in the spring's sweet time,
And God renews the earth as in her early prime.

C. Q.

THE LOOM OF TIME. (FOR THE CLOSE OF THE YEAR.)

Time is a weaver of unwearied powers;
His loom, the clock—at which he weaves the hours;
The pendulum his shuttle—to and fro,
It shoots with varied threads of weal or woe;
The piece in hand, alternate black and white,
Is human life, composed of day and night;
The texture course or fine doth aptly show,
Our varied grades in life or high or low;
The pattern fixed, yet opening to our gaze,
Marks the mixed fortunes of man's chequered days.
The warp is time long since behind us left;
The days but lately traversed are the weft;
Whose cross-thread from the shuttle shot the last,
Is from the pendulum the instant past;
The last of all that from the shuttle flies,
Is the dread moment when the mortal dies!
Well if to shine in a more glorious dress,
The all-perfect robe of Jesu's righteousness.

H. L. W.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ON THE NATIONAL CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

Lectures by DR. CHALMERS; *Essays* by W. ROBERTS, Esq., and the REV. W. NICHOLSON; *the Parochial System*, by the Rev. H. W. WILBERFORCE; *Report of the Christian Influence Society.*

WE commenced our Review of these publications in our Number for October, and there noticed Dr. Chalmers's Lectures and Mr. H. Wilberforce's Essay. It remains that we devote a few pages to Mr. Roberts and Mr. Nicholson, whose productions well deserved the joint premium allotted to them.

Mr. Roberts being a layman, his work merits especial notice; not on the disparaging ground, that a cleric is not as honest and we may add as disinterested an advocate, in matters connected with Christianity, as a laic—for the laic has the immeasurable interest of a soul to be saved, and what higher interest can the cleric have?—but because, in the practical working of the external machinery of the visible church of Christ, some particulars may occur to a bystander which had been overlooked by those who—if we may so speak—are professionally engaged in the adjustment. Mr. Roberts has been a keen observer of men and manners for at least half a century; his professional works as a barrister earned him reputation in his own profession; his lighter effusions of elegant literature, and his able and edifying moral, political, and miscellaneous papers in the British Review, extended his celebrity to a wider circle; and in later years his "Portraiture of a Christian Gentleman," his invaluable biography of Hannah More, and now the Essay before us, have exhibited him still more prominently as an instructor of his countrymen upon subjects of the most serious import; and proved that while his elegant pen has lost none of its classical polish or intellectual vigour, it has been consecrated by loftier imaginings than those which terminate with man's mortal career; and that pleasant as may be the sparkling waters of Helicon, there is a purer fount amid the shades of Siloa, and beside the sacred walls of Zion. Sure we are, from the internal evidence of the pages now in our hands, that Mr. Roberts would gladly sacrifice, were it necessary, all literary distinction, to turn one sinner to righteousness; and that he will account it the highest praise of his little book, that it inculcates principles which, if deeply imbibed and duly acted upon, would, by the blessing of God, renew the face of our beloved country with the verdure of a perpetual spring. The Gospel he shews to be the basis of all that deserves the name of social and national, as well as individual amelioration; and as an instrument for diffusing the knowledge and practice of it, he exhibits the importance, and inculcates the duties, of a national established church.

True, it may be said, but the field is immeasurably wide; how then, or where, shall we begin our operations? and while wasting time in asking and answering this puzzling question, we often just do nothing, because we cannot do everything. Mr. Ro-

berts wisely opens his essay by forestalling and disposing of this disheartening rumination.

"When we set about the work of effecting a change or modification of our condition, either in our physical or moral state, the proper point at which the operation should begin, is generally a question of doubt and perplexity. The things of the natural, moral, and intellectual world, have, among themselves respectively, such a correspondence and reciprocity, and cause and effect are so interchangeable, when practically considered, that to find the clue of the labyrinth is often impossible. With an infinity before and behind him, every scheme or system of man's contrivance, which is to act upon and affect the state of his own humanity, necessarily consists of broken expedients, unadjusted by his own prudence to that mysterious order by which all things are overruled and conducted. The parts and organs which compose our bodily frame, and minister to life, are reciprocally necessary to each other. If we assume any one in particular, as imparting the first impulse; on a further investigation, we find that what it seems to produce is pre-required to its own existence. In the world of matter without us, the same circularity presents itself, 'a wheel, as it were, in the middle of a wheel.' Nor is it less observable in the moral scene of our duties and responsibilities, and the general economy of social life.

"Where then to begin the great and vital work of improvement is a difficult problem. Shall we begin with our schools? these seem to be the fountain at which the streams commence. But these must have their sources of supply. They require to be replenished by the returns of elementary moisture, and to be nourished by their own exhalations. As the preacher reminds us, 'the wind goeth forth towards the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits. All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full: into the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again.' Pastors and teachers are an emanation from our schools, and our schools owe their virtual existence to our pastors and teachers. The clergy of the land are prepared and formed in our colleges, and our colleges are conducted by our clergy. Of the clergy our bishops and ecclesiastical rulers are made, and again from our bishops and ecclesiastical rulers, the body of the clergy receive their character as well as their commission. By the administrators of our church our secular polity in its highest departments is materially influenced, and again the efficiency of these instruments depends upon the choice and appointment of them by the rulers of the state.

"From this involution in the bearings and affinities of our moral condition, we must look without us for the great first Mover. Instead of wearying ourselves in a vain search after remote causes and first principles, if each in his own department will but put forth his individual strength, the great Disposer will settle for us the question of priorities and the order of procedure. Meanwhile a renovation of strength and effect will be seen and felt in the various parts of the entire economy. We systematize, we philosophize, we set about reforming our practical state by à priori plans, grounded on favourite theories, and still end where we began; the fundamental error of our schemes being generally this, that they leave out of calculation our own infirmity.

"In speculative plans of reform, not knowing where to begin, we generally begin by disturbance; loosening or removing parts which have come together by a fitness which time, and exigency, and concurring events, as much beyond human foresight, as above human controul, have matured and confirmed. In our own nation, the truth of these remarks has often been exemplified. A great deal of time has been wasted in examinations into the evils of our system, rather in the spirit of scientific research; than with the serious and sober purpose of specific correction. It has been more a matter of philosophy than feeling.

"In whatever class improvement is effected, the voice of public feeling is, instrumentally considered, generally entitled to the credit of producing it. He must know little of what are called the signs of the times, who does not perceive this,—who does not recognize in the preponderancy of opinion, whichever way it tends, a force which neither prescription, nor legitimacy, nor law, can long successfully oppose.

Among practical expedients therefore for accomplishing the substantial improvement of any institution of man, or any order of society, the most efficacious is that which brings a rectified public opinion to bear upon it, and lay it under a strong and urgent requisition. It is the action of this secret momentum, which has wrought a reformation in the plan of instruction pursued in

our universities; and to the same influence we are to look for a Christian revolution in the management of our chartered Schools, and the general maxims of popular education."

There is an abundance of "seeds of things," in these practical suggestions. Let us improve our engines as much as we can; but, in the meantime, let us diligently work with those we have; for if these were kept more clean, better oiled, and plied more diligently, they would probably be far more effective than those newer inventions which some would substitute for them; and certainly more effective than they are when carelessly managed. Mr. Hunt used to tell noisy crowds, that the best way to procure quietness was for no one to call out "silence;" and we may in like manner add, that the best way to get through work, is for all to begin, without losing time in discussing who has hitherto been most idle. Mr. Roberts admonishes us on this point:

"It is a waste of effort to seek by argument to charge the evil of the day on any class of men. Where dependence is reciprocal, the blame will be always shifting its place. When every Christian shall take blame to himself, and the clergy more especially shall, with the humility of the Apostle, proclaim themselves the chief of sinners with respect to their office, and all shall go on in this spirit, the great work of blessedness will be in manifest progress, and the kingdom of the Saviour will exhibit a sensible enlargement. Where each thus appropriates the blame, each will give his hand to the labour of reparation under the great repairer of the breach. 'They shall build the old wastes; they shall raise up the former desolations.' It is that one great work into which all may intrude themselves, and no confusion result from unrestricted intermeddling. The wall of our Jerusalem will become the monument of the subdivided labour of each contributory workman before his own door."

This is the way the hundreds of miles of pavement in London are kept clean; each man is obliged to sweep before his own door. But this local purification does not supersede the necessity of public officers to superintend the whole of the arrangements of a town or parish; and in the moral community, the clergy, in an especial manner, perform this office of municipal conservators. Here again we have Mr. Roberts for our ally:

"If public opinion is to be raised, and raised it must be, to act with imperative effect upon all the functional parts of our polity in church or state, it must be by the efforts of the national clergy,—animated by a zeal that courts a re-action upon its own body: raising an expectation which calls upon the teacher to graduate higher in his own school; and creating a rebound between the agent and recipient. Thus the cause of the gospel condescends to the course and manner of human progression."

But who is to keep the keepers? what is to influence the clergy who are to influence others? and what is the instrument with which they are to work, in exercising that influence? We are now approaching a subject of solemnly serious consideration. Vain were all the devisings of human philosophy to enlighten and regenerate mankind; it was the Gospel alone, which, under the power of its Divine Author, could effect this miraculous work; and it is the Gospel preached, simply and faithfully, which its ministers must wield as the power of God unto salvation. Mr. Roberts writes upon this topic not more eloquently than scripturally:

"In vain will a national clergy exert itself in this great cause, if it keep not constantly in its view the holy aphorism above quoted—'I am the way, the truth, and the life.' Until the epoch of this blessed promulgation of light and leading in the path of salvation, the mind of man has tried all its resources of self-generated wisdom, in the search after speculative and practical truth; till their reveries fell into contempt, even with philosophers themselves. Weary of 'walking' in these 'vain shadows,' they found relief and

refreshment in the retreat of universal scepticism.

"Two general opinions, under various modifications, had long divided the disputers of this world. Man was either degraded to the level of the brute, and deity dismissed to an eternity of voluptuous abstraction from the earth and its interests; or, in order to contract the distance between gods and men, the soul was dressed out in the attributes of divinity. The history of this dark dynasty of error, which so long enslaved the heart and intellect of man, should be kept full in our retrospect, to enable us to appreciate what we have gained by that single sentence, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.'

"No such pregnant words have ever met the ear, or addressed the understanding. All the devices of man have done homage to their mysterious efficacy. Philosophy, with all its pomp of ethics, has been put to the blush by them, and has seen all its centuries of gathered wisdom dispersed by a breath. 'Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.' But to what conclusion does this bring us? Is it not to this?—that as there is no other name under heaven whereby we can be saved, so there is no other name whereby we can be safely governed, influenced, and sustained. Of that great name which is above every name, the words which have been cited are only an expansion. In the proportion in which our clergy acknowledge and feel the sanctity of this name, and follow out its plenary import as 'the way, the truth, and the life,' will be the success of their attempts to elevate public opinion. For this task fidelity is a better qualification than ingenuity. In imparting knowledge we confer power, but often irregular, equivocal, or selfish power, acting by means and ministers which make it doubly mischievous. But there is a 'power by the spirit of the Lord' which accompanies that word which 'when it goeth forth giveth light and understanding unto the simple.' With that power, both to exercise and impart it, must our clergy go forth, if the great multitude is to be moved onward in the march of real improvement. It takes no less a lever than this to give to the mass an inch in advance in the moral scale. No other teaching can be made to bear with effect upon the people but that which has been first taught by the Great Teacher. And the process must be regular. It is through Him only who is 'the power of God, and the wisdom of God,' that unclean lips are made capable of conveying the divine message, and that the clay of those who receive it is changed into tempered mortar for 'the edifying of the body of Christ.'

"'I am the way, the truth, and the life,' are words of universal challenge. They admit neither partnership nor competition. They charge all other systems with folly. They claim to be all or nothing; and when they have reduced the mutinous into captivity, they call upon the rebel to glory in his chains. Words they are 'more to be desired than gold;' nor are there any words whereby men can be better taught, or in the keeping whereof there is greater reward. It is the lesson comprehended in these words which turned philosophy from the idols of the schools to seek 'the supreme good' in the testimony of the true God and the discoveries of his word.

"Insisting upon this great truth may our clergy go with courage and confidence among the people, little solicitous about other aid than the aid of Him 'in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.' Let them keep in the old paths, adhering to the simplicity of the Gospel, and suppressing the spirit of adventure and curiosity; which, if it multiplies topics to suit the demands of the pulpit, and to serve as materials for display, tends assuredly to dissipate unity, dissever force, and increase exposure to attack, by widening the area of dispute.

"These remarks are designed principally to draw attention to the importance of that humble but firm posture of *mind* which a clergyman should bring with him to his ministrations, and of that faithful simplicity to which he is pledged in the subject matter of his teaching. Awful is the responsibility attaching upon each one of a class of persons who alone among men have the authoritative means committed to them, of awakening, alarming, and persuading the conscience and the heart, by the terrors and invitations of the glorious Gospel."

We have now spoken of the clergy as agents, and of the Gospel as the motive power with which they must work; but there must also be some arrangements of external machinery; and among these, those of our own National

Church require especial consideration. The following is Mr. Roberts's justly high estimate of their suitability:

"The church has, in all her services, performed a mother's part. By the beautiful and solemn prayers which accompany each of her celebrations, she seeks to interest the attendants, and win a soul by surprise. With this collateral aim all her services are calculated for public participation, and suppose the presence of a sympathizing congregation. That must needs be accredited as a wise economy in which things are so ordered, that the interest and exigence of each individual are made conducive to the great end and purpose in which all are ultimately concerned. And this is the catholic and holy design of our church; but alas! it languishes in the letter of the rubric. Were 'the spirit of ghostly strength' to be vouchsafed to it as the reward of a simultaneous effort of prayer and supplication, the most essential reform that any constitutional polity ever exhibited would suddenly manifest itself in this country, with not a single organic change. No dream of philanthropy has ever imagined so fair an Utopia as would then be realized. To lift the great mass of our church communicants out of a formal concurrence with her several institutions into a close sacramental union with all her liturgical offices, ordinary, occasional, and special, is the object to which every Christian patriot must, at this moment, if he is honest and consistent, direct his efforts: but the minister of God, of the Holy God, where is he? and what is he doing? May the answer be—not that he is at the festive board, or leading the dance; but that 'the watchman of Ephraim is with his God;' that he is ministering in the sanctuary, or standing between the living and the dead!

"If our church is in danger, she is not without defence. She has a rich arsenal; she wants only brave sons who will draw out the means of her protection from her own magazines. Her formularies are among her best safeguards, but their efficiency depends upon the manner of using them. It is only for the sake of souls that she deserves our care. To be the object of our solicitude, she must be in function and operation. It is in the luminous circuit of her ministerial charge that she 'lives, and moves, and has her being.' Her glory is in her travail. She presses on from strength to strength in the preparation and exercise of her children. Her rites form so many successive lessons and grades in the furtherance of Christian proficiency. To make her services tell, and turn to their proper account, in impressiveness and in effect, is the true policy of those who love her cause. All her offices are made for permanence; but the want of a due application and connection has rendered them as evanescent as the dew upon the rose."

Mr. Roberts illustrates these remarks by tracing the consecutiveness of our various services from the baptismal font to the altar, and from the altar to the grave. And now what is his "new plan" for rendering all this more effective than it too often is? for it generally happens that when a writer lays down such statements as the above, it is as a preliminary to some favourite theory or novel modification of practical detail. Mr. Roberts repeats on this subject what he set out with:

"In the view here taken of our church economy and its system of edification, the writer has no new plan to propose. The whole object of this essay is to enforce the necessity of making an actual operative beginning. To him it seems that no new plan is wanted. He goes further. He thinks our plans are our hindrances. When men are so bent upon improvement that they overlook their existing resources, they may be said to outrun their speed. And this is one of the bad habits of the present day. A great deal of valuable time is lost in desultory aims. Projects take the place of action. We are mending when we should be moving, contriving when we ought to be executing."

But in disclaiming "new plans," our author does not mean to reject any valuable aid towards carrying old ones into more adequate action. If, for example, it is the old plan to have an Established Church, and an efficient parochial apparatus, so as to bring home sacred ministrations and pastoral labours to every hamlet and hovel in the kingdom; it is not a new plan, but only an application or expansion of the old

one, to build new churches where wanted, and to divide parishes when desirable, and to appoint additional clergymen, and to institute schools and Bible and Tract societies and Visiting societies, and whatever also may be of service in promoting the desired object. Mr. Roberts fully admits this principle, and applies it as follows, in reference to that admirable though much calumniated institution, the "Church Pastoral Aid Society."

"It is the part of a paralyzing prudence to reject assistance on the ground of possible injury from the miscarriages or mistakes to which it may be liable. Some degree of risk accompanies the admission of every alliance, and every co-operation. But if remote possibilities of evil are suffered to outweigh proximate benefits, and certainties to give way to surmises, nothing extensively great or useful can ever be accomplished. There is even a temerity in these timorous counsels; a precipitation of choice which doubles the danger it would avoid.

"The plans and purposes of the institution calling itself the 'Church Pastoral Aid Society,' appear to be tempered by that 'right judgment' which, in company with Christian fervour, affords the best security for a correct and efficacious course of procedure. We have thus help brought us 'from the sanctuary,' and are 'strengthened out of Zion.' In large and populous parishes, under the superintendance of a single minister, sometimes broken down with his parish duties, sometimes ill in health, sometimes worn with years and cares, always, or nearly always, most inadequately maintained, the great majority never come within the sound of the gospel, and the spiritual wants of a great proportion of the people never reach the ear of him who is appointed to minister to them. These cases of destitution and misery, the arm of the church is too short to reach. More labourers are necessary; and if these labourers are, to some extent, supplied out of the funds of private and pious liberality, who is he that can find a plausible objection? The dire necessity of the case has, for some time, been forcing into existence a small accession of lay agency, and the object of the Society is to give it greater activity with greater authority; to bring it in an augmented and more efficient form within the constitutional control and discipline of our church; that something like a proportion may be created between the multitude now abandoned to sin, and the publication and ministration of the word of life.

"To assist a minister where his parish is too populous or too extensive for the possible discharge of his duties, but whose ecclesiastical income is insufficient to allow him to employ the requisite co-operation, is a part of this godly undertaking. It is an object deserving of the greatest praise and encouragement, no less for its zeal than for its humanity. It is clear, too, of all objection, even from the most scrupulous, on the ground of innovation. And if something of solemnity is sacrificed by the performance of divine service in places ordinarily used for other purposes, until our church accommodation shall be more upon a level with the spiritual wants of the people, surely the sacrifice is outweighed by the worth of the soul. The stress of the occasion consecrates the deviation; and the beauty of holiness is, to the pious heart, a worthy substitute for the furniture of the sanctuary. The first Christians held their assemblies in an upper chamber; and from the deck of a ship, or the drum-head of a barrack, prayers have sometimes ascended to the throne of grace, not, we may presume, less acceptable than incense from golden altars. The right of the bishop to authorize such extra service in any place convenient for the purpose, under the circumstances above supposed, seems no longer to be controverted."

Mr. Roberts, we see, does not think that such institutions as the Pastoral Aid Society "menace" the Church; nor does he tremble very aguishly at the machinations of Roman Catholics, political Dissenters, and other avowed opponents, while the Church is faithful to her high trust; but he sees danger in some other quarters; and two of these dangerous signs are the following:

"The church is menaced by those within her pale, who are for pushing her claims beyond legitimate and sober bounds; who bring her too near in her pretensions to that apostate church which interposes its spiritual sovereignty between God's word and God's people; which assumes a power colla-

teral to the holy record, whereby it is made of none effect by traditions, or of what effect it chooses by authoritative interpretations. There are among her sons, those who, with unnatural effort, appear to be desirous of removing her from her Scriptural basis. They would fain invert the order, and destroy the proportion between human and divine things. They would disfigure that authentic succession, which is the ornament of our church, by engrafting upon it the pretensions of a dark, superstitous, and corrupt communion."

"Again: the church is menaced by the scantiness of her room and accommodation, very inadequate still to the growing wants of the nation. To meet even the existing exigence, and much more to profit by the present stir of intelligence, the area of the Gospel had need to be doubled. We are extending our spiritual commerce over the world, while the emporium of our faith is comparatively contracted, and the number of effective labourers are insufficient for the multifarious work. If our national church is to be fed and nourished by the present system of national education, it must be commensurate with it in extent. Otherwise, when education has done its work, and prepared a member of that church to receive the benefit of her ordinances, he finds his entrance within her walls virtually interdicted. He may be told that in another quarter of a century there will be accommodation for him; but is his piety to be in abeyance till the promised period shall arrive? All this is only to mock the understanding and to trifle with the soul. If the great numerical majority now shut out of the church should, by the force of a diffused education, become a moral majority, the national church will in vain insist upon her pure and holy ritual, and her sound and Scriptural doctrines. She will encounter every where a chilling apathy and an alienated mind. A Christian government, if ours be such, must prove its title to that appellation and distinction by making a further provision for this great and transcendant exigence. It should give itself no rest until it finds out places for the temples of the Lord and habitations for the mighty God of Jacob."

Mr. Roberts gives us, in conclusion, the following instructions:

"What is sometimes called a revival seems properly to express the demonstration which should now be made of the pure profession of 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' according to the formularies of the reformed church of this nation, for which its holy founders freely gave their bodies to be burned. It is only in such a revival that we can look for safety to our establishment. The forms of our church must be substantiated and her lines filled up. The dry bones must have their sinews and their flesh laid upon them, and be made to breathe and live. Institutions which can be rendered operative and useful must no longer remain mere adumbrations of the godly purposes for which they were designed. The household of God, its spiritual economy, and its sacred appointments, should be reviewed and set in order. But let it be the church of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, which was proclaimed by them in prison and in flames, and to which they gave the Bible as the charter of its foundation, and as the trophy of their own passive triumphs. At a time when heated brains were every where teeming with excessive births, those wise and moderate men framed for us that model of doctrine, discipline, and worship which we now hold by a tenure by many regarded as precarious, in adverting to the multitudes of its assailants. But as long as our church can retreat upon Scripture, she has a fortress from which she cannot easily be expelled. Her moderation, in which in truth her safety lies, presents the aspect of continual danger to superficial observers. Placed between violent and excessive dogmas, she seems ready to become the victim of the fury and fanaticism by which she is on either side threatened. But the extremes between which she moves only the more distinctly mark out for her that middle course in which there is, proverbially, the greatest safety, and preserves her from vacillation. Her moderation may not save her from her enemies; but her moderation is not the cause of her weakness or danger. She cannot be enervated by keeping steady to the life-giving doctrines of the Gospel, with the gloomy terrors of the law on the one side, and the liberty which is 'a cloak of maliciousness' on the other; for truth is always strong, and victory is the sure reward of righteous perseverance. But if the pure doctrines with which the church was nourished at the Reformation, and which have brought her to her present growth and perfection, shall be stained or diluted by any intermixture of modern introduction, flowing in upon them from the teaching of men of her own household, having authority and the power of persuasion, then will the church be in that state of internal weakness which

will render her unequal to maintain the struggle against her assailants from without. It is expedient that those who are rallying round the church in this moment of her conflict, should have a distinct notion of what they have to contend for. Unless they are contending for the identical church for which the martyrs of Queen Mary suffered, they are not truly contending for the Church of England. If to place her at the farthest distance from Protestant dissent, they contend for a church standing on the verge of that superstition from whose vortex it was snatched at the Reformation, they are endangering the fabric of that famous era; and if, to avoid such an approximation, they adopt the error of depreciating her discipline, and disregarding her sacerdotal succession and traditional authority, they are not contending for the pure inheritance which belongs to us. In either of these cases our zeal is in great part thrown away. Neither let us contend for a state of church discipline above controul or change in its exterior condition. There is a lethargic maxim which would, under all circumstances, keep things as they are. This cannot be; things must not and cannot remain altogether as they are. A moral revolution is in progress. The church must keep pace with it. All its capacities must be awake. If a new influence, the offspring of intellect or talent, or time or accident, is at work, determining the actions and opinions of men, our ecclesiastical polity must have its hold upon this influence for maintaining its own standing and station. Public education, which is a mighty organ of moral change and social modification, if it acts independently of the church, will soon turn against it, with the press for an ally, standing, like Briareus, with its hundred hands uplifted against heaven."

Mr. Roberts having thus laid down general principles, Mr. Nicholson, without concert with him, follows them out into practical details. The two essays are appropriately bound together. Mr. Roberts assumed the motto of "Jachin"—the name of one of the pillars in the porch of Solomon's temple; Mr. Nicholson might have aptly subscribed "Boaz," the name of the other. Mr. Nicholson having pointed out the importance of the ministerial office, goes on to shew that the efficiency of the minister depends, under God, upon his being duly qualified for his office. These qualifications are stated to be natural and spiritual; the former comprise mental and intellectual ability; the latter, rectitude of motive, personal piety, devotedness of heart, religious knowledge and understanding; in other words, spiritual motives, spirituality of character, and spiritual wisdom. It is true that the unworthiness of the minister does not render abortive the ordinances of God or his promises; for the recipient, in the exercise of faith, may derive spiritual benefit where the administrator was destitute of it; but as God is pleased, in the ordinary course of his providence, to act through means and second causes, he usually employs, as an instrument, the suitability of qualification with which he invests his agents; just as he consecrated to his service the skill with which he had endowed Bezaleel and Aholiab, for decorating the tabernacle. If "he called by name" a workman for the material edifice, and "filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom and understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship," will he not also condescend to use the qualifications which He bestows upon those who are his officers in the interior of the spiritual temple? Where suitable qualifications are wanting, Mr. Nicholson shews that the consequences are deplorable: he mentions, particularly, contempt of the office; schisms in the church; and as the result, the ruin of souls. From these general considerations he goes on to speak of the ministry of the Church of England; shewing that its orders are scriptural and catholic; that its parochial distribution of ministerial labour renders it eminently suitable to promote the cause of Christ and

his Gospel in the land; but that its efficiency is impaired by defective administration. This leads him to allude to the causes of unsuitable appointments to the ministry in the Church of England; which he traces up to erroneous views of the responsibilities of the ministry; neglect of the existing precautions, numerous and stringent though they are, against the intrusion of unfit persons in the sacred office; and the abuse of church patronage. The remedies proposed for removing or modifying the evil of an unqualified ministry are, awakening the public mind to the importance and bearings of the subject; a stricter maintenance of existing regulations; a more prompt and unfettered exercise of episcopal jurisdiction; and some modification of church patronage. Having presented this full outline of Mr. Nicholson's argument, it only remains that we give a few specimens of its filling up.

Speaking of ministerial qualification he says:

"We must make a broad distinction, between the desirable and the essential qualifications of the Christian minister.; between that which may be advantageously employed in God's service, and that which cannot be dispensed with, without more or less frustrating the efficiency of the work. Regard must also be had to the several departments of the ministry, and the several orders which it has pleased God to institute in his church. For as there are different functions to be performed, so there are required different specific qualifications for the due performance of them. The bishop, who is appointed to rule the house of God, should be endued with qualities, which can be partially dispensed with in him, who sustains the subordinate office of a teacher. There are, however, certain general characteristic qualifications, without which no man can be said to possess a proper degree of fitness for any department of the ministerial office."

"The class of qualifications, which we have termed the spiritual, or qualifications of grace, must be considered as so essential, that without them the grand design of the ministry will be partially or entirely frustrated. Natural endowments may be dispensed with; but for the right discharge of spiritual functions, a certain measure of spiritual endowments must be held to be essentially necessary. And we do not merely allude to that official spirituality, with which the divine commission alone is sufficient to invest the Christian minister; but we rather refer to those internal qualifications, which are the operation of the Holy Ghost within the heart, and which determine and direct the outward conduct. We may arrange our remarks upon this point under the two leading divisions of character and conduct, the latter being the product and development of the former."

Among these qualifications Mr. Nicholson enumerates "spirituality of mind" as "essential." In our very first volume we had to defend the late excellent Bishop Barrington against certain "high-church" reviewers, as they were called (*unjustly* called, for to be truly a High-churchman, it is not to be a Romanist or Pharisee,) because his Lordship had spoken of the necessity of spiritual mindedness; and we lament to say, that even now there is the same sneer among writers of the same class, whenever this obnoxious term is mentioned. "Oh! would our bishops," said these so called "high-church" writers, "attend to this, [namely, that all persons of all communions differing from our own in the form of church government, are 'without any ground for the hope they entertain,' being excluded from the covenant of God's mercy] as their predecessors the Apostles did before them, they would contribute much more effectually to the enlargement of the flock of Christ, than by delivering Charges recommendatory of *spiritual religion*; a term to which a Quaker or Methodist may be able to attach a meaning; but which a sound churchman does not understand.

It is a religion double-distilled; its substance all evaporated *in fumo;* it may suit us when out of the body, but leads only to confusion and every evil work while we remain in it." Alas the poor bishop of Durham! we do not mean the present Bishop, but Bishop Barrington; for we do not recollect that Dr. Maltby has any where exposed himself to this harsh censure. Alas! we say, that an Anglican prelate cannot, without being vituperated, urge such declarations as that Christians are taught, renewed, and strengthened by the Spirit; that they must live, pray, sing, and bless, by the Spirit; that their deeds must be "fruits of the Spirit," and that they must be spiritually-minded in order to enjoy "life and peace." Alas, that our Cranmers, and Jewells, and Hookers, — nay, the inspired writers themselves!—should have been only Quakers and Methodists by anticipation. Yet to this comes the system of certain divines who profess to be peculiarly "apostolical;" indeed, one of the very worst things in the Oxford Tracts is the contemptuous manner in which they speak of "spiritual contemplation, and *what is called* (!!!) communion with God." We are much obliged, therefore, to Mr. Nicholson, for urging this essential feature of a truly apostolical ministry; not indeed neglecting or undervaluing any ordinance of the Gospel, but in accordance with the inspired declaration that "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth." Whereas the "physical religion of Rome," with all its abuses and corruptions, flowed from the endeavour to connect almost everything in Christianity with some external rite; giving to signs and sacraments an unscriptural prominence; exaggerating their object and effects; disparaging preaching and family prayer; and maintaining, as Dr. Pusey in one of the Oxford Tracts distinctly does, that Divine grace is attached to the Bellarmine opus operatum influence of the sacraments, though unconnected, as another tract teaches, with "faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplation, and what is called communion with God."

But we were about to quote from the Essays before us.

"*Spirituality of mind* is another essential qualification for the ministry. And by this we understand that habitual state of mind and feeling, which recognizes God in every thing; which thinks and acts with constant reference to his will as the rule, and his glory as the end; and which delights in spiritual objects and spiritual employments. The character of the mind is determined by the objects with which it is most conversant. It is therefore carnal or spiritual, according as it finds its chief gratification in 'minding the things of the flesh or of the spirit.' Now it is the distinctive mark of the spiritual man, that he minds heavenly things—that his thoughts, affections, and desires are habitually of a heavenly and spiritual nature. This we expect to find in every Christian, because his very profession of Christianity implies no less than this. But we expect to find it more prominently conspicuous in the Christian minister. He is emphatically a spiritual person. A heavenly frame of mind, and an habitual engagement of his affections on spiritual objects, seem not only proper, but absolutely essential to the character of one whose occupation is in its very nature spiritual and heavenly."

The following is the conclusion of the remarks on the evils of an unfaithful ministry:

"We may add one more evil consequence to the above, and that of such tremendous magnitude, that it throws all inferior ones into the shade. A ministry, essentially defective in qualifications, involves the *loss of souls*, and thereby a frustration of the grand design of its institution. This point requires but little proof or illustration. God has appointed the preaching of the gospel to be the instrument of 'saving those that believe.' He has intimately connected the success of the work

with the fitness of the agents; and therefore the want of a certain measure of fitness must materially affect the due accomplishment of the result. Since God has, in his infinite wisdom, instituted an order of means for the attainment of his purposes, it cannot be expected that He should depart from his ordinary method. This however is not a matter of mere speculation and conjecture; it is susceptible of proof. Experience plainly shews us, that there is an essential difference in the actual effects produced by the ministry of the gospel in the hands of different individuals. In some instances we find it productive, in various degrees, of the blessed fruits which its Divine Author intended it to produce; in others we look in vain for any substantial results. Where the pastoral office is faithfully discharged, there Christ's wandering sheep are usually brought home to his fold; where the flock is feebly and negligently tended, there we behold them wandering on to their destruction. It is an unquestionable fact, that, for the most part, sinners remain unconverted and unenlightened, and therefore unsaved, under a ministry of the word, defective with regard to its fundamental qualifications. If therefore the souls of men perish for lack of that knowledge, which alone can 'make them wise unto salvation,' surely it is not too much to assert, that the loss of those souls is in a manner chargeable upon those who had solemnly pledged themselves 'to feed the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.'"

Mr. Nicholson considers at some length the subject of ecclesiastical patronage. Upon the whole he defends the present system; but he wishes to see it placed under stricter guards and limits. Thus he says:

"In considering the question of patronage, it is exceedingly unfair to lose sight of these restrictions upon the patron's authority — restrictions which, if duly and conscientiously enforced, would go far to render the appointment of a decidedly unqualified person in the highest degree improbable. According to this view, there is no unlimited and irresponsible power vested in the patron, of obtruding upon a parish one who may be utterly unfit to be its pastor. The utmost that he can do, is to place before the bishop a candidate for his acceptance and approbation. And the question whether that person shall or shall not be the recognized minister of the charge to which the patron has appointed him, rests, according to the tenor of the canon law, with the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. Here then is all the necessary apparatus for interposing an effectual *veto* upon every unsuitable appointment. Here is a check, which if carried out into practice would so modify the evils to which any system of private or official patronage is necessarily liable, that virtually they might be said to have no existence. But here the secular power steps in with its uncalled-for and obtrusive interference. The authority of the bishop is in the present day, to a certain extent, fettered or neutralized by the stronger arm of the civil magistrate. It does not lie within his power, in all cases, to put in force the plenary authority with which *the church* has invested him. He might perhaps find himself placed in opposition to the code of national law, if he were to attempt to enforce his just and scriptural prerogative. A writ of 'quare impedit' might be issued, which would place the decision of the matter beyond his controul, and probably hand it over to others, who might be little qualified to decide upon the spiritual fitness of the individual in question. Certain it is, that a bishop, who should conscientiously refuse to institute an improper person to a benefice, would find his intentions not unfrequently thwarted, and his decision reversed in a temporal court; and the authority, which was expressly assigned to him for the protection of the church, would practically be rendered of no avail, by the intermeddling of worldly policy in matters of purely spiritual jurisdiction. It is a most lamentable circumstance, that the 'godly discipline' of the church, which, were it left to itself, would be capable of remedying innumerable disorders, should thus be frustrated. And there could not dawn a brighter or more auspicious day upon the Church of England, than that wherein her rights and privileges should be delivered from this usurped domination."

If Mr. Nicholson were to propose this plan to our most highly conservative statesmen, more especially in the House of Lords, among the members of which there is an enormous mass of church patronage, he would find it objected that the pecuniary value of the "property" of the church is too

valuable to be committed to the irresponsible jurisdiction of individual prelates; that bishops have not themselves been always free from mistake or nepotism; that the Sparkess of Ely are not of necessity a better race than the sons, brothers, cousins, and dependants of lay-lords; that to give bishops an irresponsible veto upon all ecclesiastical appointments, would be in effect to subject the whole church patronage of the land to their power, as a bishop might go on objecting till his own friend or nominee was chosen; that a bishop of the mind of Bishop Barrington's "high-church" reviewer, might have rejected his Lordship, when nominated as a presbyter to a benefice, on the ground that his spiritual-minded notions were unknown to the Church of England, and were fit only for Methodists or Quakers; whereas another bishop, of easy or time-serving views, might have admitted him, even with more considerable flaws extending from doctrine to conduct, upon consideration of his rank and family influence. In truth, the question is so complicated, when viewed with reference to the actual condition of our church in connexion with the state as a national establishment; the absence of the wholesome check of a convocation; the political influence through which our prelates are appointed, and the secular tyranny by which our deans and chapters are constrained to elect whomever the Prime Minister for the day selects for the office; that it is not quite so easy to settle in practice, as in theory, what should be the extent of the power of bishops in the matter of patronage. We frankly confess that we should scruple to give Lord Melbourne, or any other premier, the power which Mr. Nicholson's proposition, without some countervailing checks, would afford him; though we would strongly urge the necessity of enabling our bishops legally to refuse institution to a clerk upon due proof being given that his doctrines or morals were exceptionable. Mr. Nicholson himself quotes four sources of misdirected patronage, traceable to *political, family, literary,* and *mercenary* motives; and we do not see that giving a bishop the power of irresponsible rejection would obviate them. The roots of the question penetrate far deeper; and though under the existing circumstances of the church we should dread the revival of a convocation, quite sure we are that our present condition is as unsafe as it is anomalous.

LIFE OF WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.

(*Continued from* p. 594.)

We gave, in our Number for September, a syllabus of the contents of this work; a general critique upon its character and execution; and a selection of passages during the first thirty years of Mr. Wilberforce's life, up to and beyond that grand turning-point in his character, subsequent to which he grew in grace and in the knowledge of his Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, till he was gathered into the heavenly garner, as a shock of corn fully ripe for the harvest. It only remains that, before we finally lay aside the volumes, we add a few pages of extracts, interesting not merely at the moment, but for future perusal when the work shall have ceased to float

upon the stream of passing literature, and may not be at hand for reference.

A very large portion of these volumes relates to that great struggle, and ultimate triumph, in the cause of justice and humanity, which is indelibly associated with the name of Wilberforce. To attempt, in the present remarks, to sketch an outline of the history of this fifty years' war—for it can only be said to have closed on the first of last August—would be futile: a volume would not do justice to it. The chief heads of Mr. Wilberforce's proceedings are noticed in the syllabus before mentioned, in our Number for September; the details must be sought for elsewhere. Many of them may be found in Mr. Clarkson's History of the Abolition; many in the work before us; and not a few in our own volumes: for it could not be that a periodical publication, planned by Mr. Wilberforce and his friends, and for many years edited by Mr. Macaulay—that retiring, unassuming, but ever active, intelligent, efficient, and unwearied labourer in this great cause—should not make the abolition of the slave-trade, and afterwards of slavery, a very prominent object of its exertions; indeed it was almost the only Church of England periodical work which did not either insidiously impede, or fiercely and slanderously oppose, Mr. Wilberforce's proceedings. The zeal, the laborious diligence, the perseverance, the wisdom, the large pecuniary and personal sacrifices, the religious and prayerful spirit — we need not add the eloquence—with which those proceedings were conducted, are most interestingly illustrated in the volumes before us by extracts from Mr. Wilberforce's own Diary and Letters.

We lament deeply to relate that a controversy has arisen between Mr. Clarkson and the sons of his old friend, in consequence of some statements made by them in the memoir of their father, respecting his venerable surviving colleague. We fear that we cannot go far into the matter without offending both parties, and making bad worse; we shall therefore say no more than as honest reviewers we are bound to do. We perused, with much pain and regret, the disparaging remarks upon Mr. Clarkson in these volumes; and certainly they were not required in order to add lustre, by comparison, to Mr. Wilberforce's character or labours. Mr. Clarkson's early, indefatigable, exhausting, and invaluable energy and devotedness to this great object of his life, demand the warmest gratitude of every friend of Africa; and render it extremely distressing, that in his old age any unkind whisper should fall upon his ear. Yet if we are to speak impartially we cannot but say that his History of the Abolition was well calculated to provoke some censure from the friends of his colleagues in that momentous struggle. As to whether Mr. Wilberforce or Mr. Clarkson initiated the proceedings, and which of them conducted the early stages with the greatest zeal, the question is as fruitless as it is invidious. Both were earliest, and both were best, in their respective spheres; and we trust that the controversy upon the subject will neither be so long nor so acrimonious as that which raged for many years respecting the claims of Newton and Leibnitz to the invention of fluxions; or the more recent debate as to who first planned the device of breaking the enemy's line in a naval 'engagement. Indeed, the late Mr. Latrobe, with much circumstantiality of dates and facts, maintained, from personal recollection, the claims of Lady Middleton, as the

practical abolitionist of the slave-trade; she having urged her husband, Sir Charles, in 1786, to bring its horrors, which had been detailed to them by Mr. Ramsay, before Parliament; and he, at her request, having written to Mr. Wilberforce to undertake the business. Granville Sharp also, and others, had led the way; and, in truth, no right-minded man who happened to become acquainted with the horrors of the system, but must have wished for its abolition; though the accomplishment of that consummation was reserved for Mr. Wilberforce and his honoured coadjutors, in the very highest rank of which stands Mr. Clarkson.

With regard to the claims of this venerable individual, no abolitionist was ever disposed to undervalue them; his own extracts from the letters and speeches of his friend Mr. Wilberforce prove this; as also the recent testimonials which have been published. But if we said that we do not think that from knowing more of what he himself thought and felt and did, than of what passed in the minds of others, or was breathed by their lips, or effected by their hands, he has not over-estimated his own share of the work, we should assert what facts will not warrant. The filial biographers quote Mr. Latrobe as writing in 1815:

"As to Mr. Clarkson's account, I should have forgiven him the display of his own laborious and unwearied exertions in the cause, in which he certainly exceeded others, had he but done justice to the merits of those, who most contributed to make his labours effectual in accomplishing the desired end."

"He has been charged with egotism by many reviewers, and I believe no one can read it without an impression left upon his mind that the author takes great merit to himself, and almost makes himself out to be the main-spring and chief instrument in bringing about that great event. He was aware that such a charge might be brought against him, and in some part of his work makes a kind of apology with a view to avert it, but which, as far as I remember, appeared to me to be rather lame."

Now this we happen to know was the opinion of those early abolitionists, the late Master Stephen and Mr. Macaulay; as R. and S. Wilberforce intimate, it was the opinion of their father, and as we believe also it was of Mr. Thornton; though none of these eminent men found any fault as regarded their own services; each, however, being jealous for his colleagues.

That we may not be charged with proffering a statement now that all the parties except Mr. Clarkson are gone to their rest, which was not made when they were alive, and when the facts were comparatively recent, and the deponents might be confronted, we will transcribe the deliberate opinion of Mr. Macaulay, as expressed in our own pages. The review of "Reasons for establishing a Registry of Slaves in the British Colonies" (Christian Observer, January 1816) thus opens: "It is much to be wished that some persons competent to the task would write a full and impartial history of the abolition of the slave trade;" and it is added in a note:

"Some of our readers may suppose that such a history as we have desiderated has already been supplied by Mr. Clarkson. It is however to be observed, that his history does not reach to the present time; and that it is remarkable, chiefly, for the earnest and natural warmth of heart which it manifests [there was no wish to detract from Mr. Clarkson's generous impulses and noble zeal], and for the strange redundancies, *and still stranger omissions; and, above all, the extravagant egotism with which it abounds.*"

The case must have been very strong, to extract from Mr. Macaulay and his friends words like these, in reference to their much-valued fellow-labourer. To get "a full and *impartial* history," the

whole tale, it was affirmed, must be re-written; for Mr. Clarkson's history was "remarkable" for its "strange redundancies," and "still *stranger omissions*;" but, "above all," for its "extravagant egotism;" —that is, he omitted much that ought to have been said of others, and said too much of himself. Now this was stated nearly three and twenty years ago, when most of the leaders in the struggle were living; and it is not likely that neither Mr. Clarkson, nor any of his friends, saw it; for the Christian Observer was very generally read and referred to by the abolitionists as an authentic channel of anti-slave trade and anti-slavery information; and Mr. Clarkson himself, and the Quakers, were well-acquainted with its pages: indeed the review of Mr. Clarkson's Life of Penn, in its pages in 1813, gave rise to a controversy, in which Mr. Tuke came forward as Mr. Clarkson's ally in defence of Quakerism; and subsequently, in 1818, Mr. Clarkson's Peace Society publication was discussed in our pages, and one T. C. wrote a defence of it, which we cheerfully inserted. If, then, the charge urged in the review, of the absence of impartiality, and echoed and enlarged in Mr. Macaulay's additional note, was not well-founded, why was it not replied to at the time?

The volume of the Christian Observer for 1816 was the last which Mr. Macaulay conducted; the work from that period having been consigned to the present Editor. We do not know that Mr. Clarkson's name again occurs in connexion with this subject, except once in 1818, p. 753; where, in quoting from a work on the Millennium by Mr. Bogue, a bitter and somewhat revolutionary political Dissenter, a prayer that "God, who raised up a Howard to visit the prisons of Europe, and inspired a Clarkson to devote his life to the destruction of African slavery, and crowned his zeal with success," would raise up some philanthropist to promote Peace societies—we penned the following note upon the word Clarkson: "Why did not Mr. Bogue add a Wilberforce or a Thornton? Was it because they were Churchmen?" The writer of that note had no pretension to any personal acquaintance with the early stages of the abolition contest; but he had opportunities of knowing what were the impressions of Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Macaulay, and Mr. Thornton; and the above note was significantly intelligible at the period when it was written. If Mr. Bogue was aware of the relative claims of Wilberforce, Thornton, Sharp, Hoare, Macaulay, Stephen, and Clarkson, (we might add others), and yet selected the last for his undivided eulogy, he did it invidiously; if he came to his conclusion from reading Mr. Clarkson's pages, then the point is proved that those pages were not impartial but egotistical. We may add, that we shewed the above note to Mr. Macaulay, and that it received his *imprimatur*. We could not, from delicacy, at that time, add his name in the Christian Observer to those of his friends; but it is second to none in the exertions made for the abolition of the slave-trade and slavery.

Much as we lament that the biographers should have given rise to this discussion; and doubly so that they should have inserted some passages quite uncalled for, and very painful to Mr. Clarkson and his friends; we have thought it due, in fairness, to give the above statement, which shews that there was some reason for their wishing to amend the not correctly apportioned allotments of Mr. Clarkson. If the sons of Mr. Stephen or of Mr. Macaulay had written the lives of their fathers,

they might probably have complained on the same score. We may add also, that some questions arose which led Mr. Clarkson more into one line of intercourse, while some of his colleagues were pursuing another; so that each might not see all that his colleagues were doing; for Mr. Clarkson, though educated at Cambridge, joined the Society of Friends, and also became a most zealous admirer of the French revolution; and his extreme Radical politics (as we should now call them) greatly damaged the question in many quarters; much as Mr. O'Connell's did the anti-slavery question in later times. We could make quite a pretty quarrel as to who was the chief agent in the abolition of slavery; for he who was foremost in one department, might be little known in another. Here, then, we drop the matter. We only wish that Messrs. R. and S. Wilberforce had simply exhibited their father's claims, and thus corrected what was defective in Mr. Clarkson's statement, without penning one single word which could be painful to that much-loved and esteemed philanthropist. *We* have not mooted the subject; it is forced upon us by the pending controversy.*

We now proceed to our more agreeable duty of offering, without the interruption of note or comment, a few miscellaneous extracts as specimens of the book; the more desultory the better for that purpose.

"'April 15th, 1795. Called at Pitt's the first time since before the beginning of the session—he having the gout, and I going out of town—talked about Lord Fitzwilliam.' '25th. To Battersea Rise—called Eliot's, knowing that Pitt was there, and that Eliot knew I knew it, and thinking therefore it would seem unkind not to do it. 26th, Sunday—Venn; morning. I had meant to be quiet to-day, and hoped to be able to employ myself in devotional exercises, when after church Pitt came with Eliot; and considering he did it out of kindness, I could not but walk back with him. He talked openly, &c. After my return home, R. Smith came to see me, and afterwards Rennel came, self-invited, to dinner, and staid—talked all the afternoon—very clever, much good in him, great courage, scarcely serious enough, but much respect for good, and zeal against vice—talents to make him eminently useful. Oh may God support me in this hurrying week upon which I am entering.' 'Saturday, May 2nd. All Pitt's supporters believe him disposed to make peace. To Royal

* Mr. Clarkson's friends quote the poets Wordsworth and Southey, (they might add Montgomery and Graham,) as speaking in very exalted strains of him, in verses written some thirty years ago. But these poetical references are not documental authority as to his relative share in the abolition struggle; for not one of the writers was personally acquainted with the early circumstances of the contest; and their statements were written shortly after the publication of Mr. Clarkson's own book; and well might they glow in the perusal, and take up their lyre to celebrate the almost martyr in the cause—for such he was by his zealous devotion to it. His History was published in 1807; Mr. Montgomery's poem in 1810, in a volume entitled "Poems on the Abolition of the Slave-trade, by J. Montgomery, J. Grahame, and [Miss] E. Benger," embellished with portraits of Sharp, Clarkson, and Wilberforce. Grahame celebrated Benezet, Sharp, Clarkson, Wilberforce, Lord Grenville, and the Duke of Gloucester; Montgomery sang Sharp, Clarkson, Wilberforce, Pitt (rather doubtfully), and Fox. It is not impossible that the names of Stephen and Macaulay might have had a passing poetical tribute, if Mr. Clarkson, as a historian, had duly noticed their long-continued, laborious, and efficient exertions; but, strange to say, their names are not even mentioned in his narrative, except where they once incidentally occur in the list of a committee. No one can speak more honourably or affectionately than Mr. Clarkson now does, and long has done, of both those eminent philanthropists; but not to have known what they had been doing so ably and during so many years, from the very infancy of the abolition struggle, proves that his narrative did not give an accurate account of the matter.

Academy dinner—sat near Lord Spencer, Windham, &c.—too worldly minded—catches and glees—they importunate for Rule Britannia—I doubt if I had much business at such a place. What a painted shadow! It is not right for me entirely to abstract myself from the world; yet what a gay dream was this! O God, do Thou for Christ's sake fill my soul with the love of Thee, and all other things will grow insipid.'"

"'July 15th. Spent the day in more than ordinary devotional exercises and fasting, and found comfort, and hope some benefit.' 'It seems something providential that, wanting to devote the day mainly to secret religious exercises, fasting, self-examination, humiliation, and supplication for myself and others, I should be left unexpectedly alone.' The result of examination shows me that though my deliberate plans are formed in the fear of God, and with reference to His will, yet that when I go into company (on which I resolve as pleasing to God) I am apt to forget Him; my seriousness flies away; the temptations of the moment to vanity and volatility get the better of me. If I have any misgivings at the time, they are a sullen, low, grumbling of conscience, which is disregarded. Although, therefore, I am not defective in external duties to God, or grossly towards my fellow creatures, but rather the contrary, (though here no man but myself knows how much blame I deserve,) yet I seem to want a larger measure, 1st, of that true faith which realizes unseen things, and produces seriousness; and, 2nd, of that vigour of the religious affections, which, by making communion with God and Christ through the Spirit more fervent and habitual, might render me apt and alert to spiritual things. My finding no more distinct pleasure in religious offices (vide David's Psalms every where) argues a want of the Holy Spirit. This might not be inferred so positively in every case, because different mental constitutions are differently affected. Mine I take to be such as are capable of a high relish of religion. I ought to be thankful for this; I am responsible for it; it will be a blessing and help well used, and if neglected it will increase my condemnation. Therefore let me cultivate the religious affections. I think it was better with me in this respect formerly; at least I felt then more religious sensibility. This was in part natural. Yet let me quicken those things which are ready to die.'

"Yet though he was thus disposed to condemn himself, his private Journal bears the clearest marks of an unusual warmth of spiritual affections. 'My eyes,' says an entry of this time, 'are very indifferent—tears always make them so, and this obliges me to check myself in my religious offices.'"

"'Dec. 22nd, 1796. Busy this week about Militia and Cavalry Bills. House—went home with Dundas and Pitt, and staid awhile discussing—Mission business in hand. 23rd. Breakfasted early with Dundas and Eliot on Mission business; Dundas complying, and appointing us to dinner again, where Grant and David Scott also—sat long. Then Pitt's, with whom Bishop of Lincoln;—having just heard of Lord Malmsbury failing, and being ordered back—staid late, talking about it. 24th. Kept in town all morning, expecting House. Dined Bankes's quietly, then Pitt's, where with Mornington, Speaker, &c. read despatches. Went home heavy. 26th. Grant, Eliot, and Babington at dinner—*consultation on East Indian missions*, and discussing all evening. 27th. To town on business—Army and Navy Bills. Saw Pitt, and home to Battersea Rise—employed all evening. 28th. Thought of and read politics for to-morrow. 29th. Politics—Battersea Rise all day—talking politics with Henry Thornton. 30th. To town after political preparation. Dined Bankes's, and talked with him on the state of things—very doubtful—address on Lord Malmesbury's negociation—kept late in House. Pitt very earnest with me not to speak.'

"The business of the House of Commons closed with this debate. 'The recess for six weeks is commencing. I once meant to try to finish my tract, but I now rather think that, the time being too little for so very serious a work, I shall devote it to preparation for the House of Commons—improvement in speaking, which sadly neglected, and in knowledge. May God preserve me the while from vanity, and enable me to continue humble, and to devote all my faculties, powers, and studies to His service.' His plans were interrupted by a violent attack of sickness. 'Sunday, Jan. 1st. Cecil's morning—good sermon from Bean—very serious. Staid in town to be quiet and recollect matters.' 'I have felt much comfort and some humiliation; what cause have I for it! My life, alas, has been sadly unprofitable, when my opportunities are considered. I would now humbly resolve to amend, and through God's grace live soberly, righteously, humbly, and godly. This year I have been preserved from many evils. What a black aspect do public affairs

present! and what a lesson to us to make sure of a better inheritance!' 'Monday, Jan. 2nd. Slept ill, and very indifferent—feared I was about to be as bad as the famous time,' (1788,) 'and suffered much—sent to Pitcairne. Had death, as probable, in view, and felt I hope resigned, but no ardour or warmth—confined for a few days.'"

"'What cause have I for humiliation,' are his secret reflections on Sunday the 27th, 1798, 'in my temper in the House of Commons on Friday evening, when Pitt greatly provoked me, by intervening between me and Lushington, and putting off the Slave Carrying Bill. Alas, love how cold in me! I was near resenting it upon the spot. I now am thankful that I did not. O God, how full of mercies hast Thou been to me!' 'How little' (he continues, Sunday, June 17th) 'did I think that Pitt's conduct, which, poor fellow, made him mortify me, would draw him as it did into the scrape which produced his duel,' (with Tierney) 'which took place on the very day (of my former entry), at three o'clock. How thankful for Christianity to sooth my angry spirit! and with what pleasure did I look back during that Sunday on my conduct in making it up with him without show on that same day.'"

"'It is my fixed opinion, formed on much reading, consideration, and experience, that there has been for many years among the majority of our clergy a fatal and melancholy departure from the true principles of Christianity, and of the Church of England; from those principles which prevail throughout her Articles, her Liturgy, the writings of her venerable martyrs, and of many of her brightest ornaments. I am not speaking of speculative matter; this declension, or, if I would give it its true name, this heresy, is important, because its practical effects are in the highest degree mischievous. I have stated this in my late publication as clearly and as strongly as I could. The inference from it is obvious. In selecting a minister for any living it is not enough to know that he is diligent and exemplary in his conduct, nor yet that his talents, knowledge, and manner of officiating are every thing that one could wish, but I must ask, what are his doctrines?'"

"His health had been unusually delicate this spring, (1799.) 'A serious return,' he told Mr. Hey, 'of illness, availing itself of the very severe and cheerless north-eastern blasts, has stuck to me more obstinately than usual. This has compelled me to lessen the number of my working hours, and has crowded into them such a multitude of matters, that I have been quite unable to clear my way.' This had enforced a 'private resolution,' which he tells Lord Muncaster he 'had been forced to form, of giving up the dining system: for the evening is the only time when I can get an hour or two of uninterrupted quiet, and I cannot, like Burgh, extend my working hours at pleasure; expend a copious stream of midnight oil, and then be as fresh the next day as if nothing had happened.' This resolution withdrew him in a measure from general society. 'I must be more executive. Dined at home before the House, refusing Pitt to meet old friends.' 'I seem to separate quietly from acquaintance.' 'Dined at Lord Camden's first late dinner for months, to meet Pitt, Lord Chatham, Bishop of Lincoln, Steele, Pepper Arden. Conversation too loose—great successes of the Austrians over the French—Pitt less sanguine than formerly, but hoping that six months will see the thing out.' More than once he mentions in his Journal this comparative 'quiet as having had some good effect upon his heart, in enabling him a little to realize unseen things, and live more in the fear of God.' 'I have been more able to bridle my passions, and be more meek and gentle, and really full of love.'

"These impressions he was most solicitous to deepen, setting apart from time to time a day for abstinence, and meditation. 'Saturday at Broomfield all day. I meant it to be a day devoted to God. The morning serious, by myself, though not so completely as I had wished. I had refused several friends, but Carlyle came suddenly with offer about Lord Elgin, and compelled to see him.' 'I have with some difficulty and management kept this day clear, to be set apart for humiliation and devotion, and such abstinence as my body will bear. I am now about to fall to self-examination, and confession, and humiliation; looking into myself; condemning myself before God, and imploring forgiveness for Christ's sake. Oh what a terrible array of sins do I behold when I look back!—early renunciation of God: then, many years entirely sinful; then, since the good providence of God drew me forth from this depth of iniquity in the autumn of 1785, how little have I improved and grown in grace! Let me now humble myself, chiefly for forgetfulness of God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and invisible things; for ingratitude to God, though loaded with mercies, recalled by sicknesses; —a thousand gracious providences! I

go to prayer, humbly throwing myself on the promised mercies of God in Christ.' 'Though, I thank God, I am less sensual than I was, yet I find my heart cold and flat. To-day I received the sacrament, but how dead was I! O God, do Thou enlighten me. May I attain what is real in Christian experience, without running into a sect, or party set of opinions.'"

"Mr. Wilberforce was busy in the Commons with a measure prepared by Lord Belgrave and himself for suppressing Sunday newspapers. It was brought forward by Lord Belgrave upon the 27th of May, 1799; upon the 30th he successfully defended its enactments from the gibes of Mr. Sheridan; but 'it was thrown out, June 11th, upon the second reading. Windham's speech philosophical. Jekyll's manner profane. I did not speak. The temper of the house against us. The Bishop of London deeply wounded at its loss.'

"When the Bill was first designed, Mr. Pitt had promised Mr. Wilberforce his co-operation, but he was persuaded by Mr. Dundas to retract his pledge, that government might not be weakened by the loss of their unlawful succour; three out of the four Sunday newspapers supporting ministry. The measure, which had almost succeeded in the hands of independent men, would have been carried through triumphantly with Mr. Pitt's concurrence."

"'I have frequently endeavoured to impress the minds of several of our Bishops with the importance, merely in a view of sound church policy, of facilitating the building of chapels of ease; nor am I altogether without hopes of having made some impression: but I durst not presume so far on the effect I had produced, as to propose my measure as I wished last session of parliament. It is an object I shall keep steadily in my eye.'"

"'Wilberforce has bought a house near Bath,' says Henry Thornton, 'which I a little lament, on the ground of the bad economy of it; for he is a man, who, were he in Norway or Siberia, would find himself infested by company; since he would even produce a population, for the sake of his society, in the regions of the earth where it is the least. His heart also is so large that he never will be able to refrain from inviting people to his house. The quiet and solitude he looks to will, I conceive, be impossible, and the Bath house will be troubled with exactly the same heap of fellows as the Battersea Rise one.'"

"'There are ideas,' he tells Mr. Hey, (March, 1800) 'of materially abridging the privileges enjoyed under the Toleration Act. I am persuaded that restraints would quicken the zeal of the Methodists and Dissenters to break through them, that prosecutions would be incessant, and that the prevalence of the persecuted opinions and the popularity of the persecuted teachers would be the sure result. I hope still that I may be able to prevent any strong measure from being brought forward.'"

"'I fear the Bishop of Lincoln (this is whispered to your private ear in the strictest confidence) will renew his attempt next year. If such a bill as was lately in contemplation should pass, it would be the most fatal blow both to church and state, which has been struck since the Restoration.'"

"'I lost no time in conferring with Mr. Pitt on the subject, but he had been strongly biassed in favour of the measure by Bishop Prettyman, on whom I urged in vain the serious consequences that must infallibly ensue. I well remember stating to him my firm persuasion, that, within a few weeks after the passing of the intended law, several of the dissenting ministers throughout the kingdom, most distinguished for talents and popularity, would be in prison; and I urged on him, that even supposing them not to be actuated by a sense of duty, for which I myself gave them credit, or to be cheered by the idea of suffering for righteousness' sake, they would be more than compensated for all the evils of imprisonment by their augmented popularity. The Bishop, however, would not assent to my view of the case, and finding Mr. Pitt intended to bring the measure forward, I begged I might have a full confidential discussion of the subject. Accordingly we spent some hours together at a tête-à-tête supper, and I confess I never till then knew how deep a prejudice his mind had conceived against the class of clergy to whom he knew me to be attached.

"'It was in vain that I mentioned to him Mr. Robinson of Leicester, Mr. Richardson of York, Mr. Milner of Hull, Mr. Atkinson of Leeds, and others of similar principles; his language was such as to imply that he thought ill of their moral character, and it clearly appeared that the prejudice arose out of the confidence he reposed in the Bishop of Lincoln. I remember proposing to him, to employ any friend whose mind should not already have received a bias on either side, to visit the several places I had mentioned, to inquire into their characters, and to

ascertain the principles and conduct of their adherents, adding my confident persuasion that both their moral and political principles would be found favourable to the peace and good order of society; indeed I went further, and alleged that they were in general friendly to his administration, from believing these to be promoted by its continuance. All however was of no avail, and all I could obtain from Mr. Pitt was an assurance that the measure should not be actually introduced without his giving me another opportunity of talking the matter over with him. Happily that opportunity never occurred; of course I was in no hurry to press for it; and the attempt never was resumed; but some years after, when Lord Sidmouth's memorable bill was in progress, which excited such an immense ferment, and produced a vast number of petitions, by which it was defeated in the House of Lords, Lord Redesdale (formerly Sir John Mitford) stated, that he well remembered that during Mr. Pitt's administration a stronger than the bill then in progress had been in contemplation, and that he did not know why it had been dropped. I must say, considering every thing, I have always been extremely thankful for any share I had in preventing the introduction of this scheme.'

"He was much 'hurt,' he tells Mrs. Hannah More, this session, at the defeat of another measure bearing upon the moral interests of the people. 'Sir William Pulteney, who brought forward the bill to suppress bull-baiting, at the instance of some people in the country, (I declined because I am a common hack in such services, but I promised to move it if nobody else would,) argued it like a parish officer, and never once mentioned the cruelty. No summonses for attendance were sent about as is usual. In consequence not one Thornton, nor many others, were present, any more than myself. I had received from some county Magistrates an acconnt of barbarities practised in this generous pastime of Windham's, which would be surpassed only by the tortures of an Indian warrior. A Surrey magistrate told a friend of mine yesterday, that some people met for a boxing match, and the magistrate proceeding to separate them, they threw their hats into the air, and declaring Mr. Windham had defended boxing in parliament, called out 'Windham and Liberty!' A strange and novel association, by the way! Canning, to do him justice, was ashamed of himself, and told me, when I showed him the account of cruelties, (which Windham read coldly,) that he had no idea of the real nature of the practice he had been defending. Alas! alas! we bear about us multiplied plague spots, sure indicatives of a falling state."

We have now brought our citations down to the close of the second volume. The next opens with the commencement of the present century; and though the memoir becomes, in many respects, increasingly interesting, yet, as the remaining portion of Mr. Wilberforce's life was better known, and his exertions for the abolition of slavery, and in promoting religious and charitable institutions, kept him almost constantly before the public eye, it will not be necessary to quote largely. For the same reason, we have passed over the publication of his "Practical View of the prevailing Religious System of professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes of this Country, contrasted with real Christianity;" for assuredly it cannot be necessary to speak of the excellence of that invaluable work, or of the immeasurable good which in the hands of God it has been the instrument of effecting. It was published in 1797; and never perhaps did any book excite greater attention, or produce more powerful effects. It was of course maligned by many, as puritanical, methodistical, and the like; but its simply beautiful style, its felicitous selection of topics, its earnest eloquence, the station and character of its author, his solemn appeals to Scripture and the documents of his own church, and the strong impression left upon every page, that he was effectually seeking the best welfare of his readers, caused it to be extensively read; and it became a principal link in that chain of events, to which, under God, we are indebted for the present widely extended revival of Scrip-

tural doctrine and practical piety. The author of the "Pursuits of Literature," closed his eulogy on the book and its author, with the remark, "I am unworthy to praise it, and I feel myself so." After such a confession from such a quarter, we may well be silent. Among the thousands who, by its instructions, have been led to serious and scriptural views of religion, were we to mention only the author of the "Dairyman's Daughter," his name would be a multitude; for while Mr. Wilberforce has spoken in person to those in the higher and middle circles of life, his proxy has addressed millions of the poorer classes; and thus, from the palace to the cottage, the "Practical View" has been an instrument of incalculable utility. In the very first half year 7500 copies were sold; and the aggregate of circulation is almost incredible for a work of such a nature. Among other plans which, about this time, Mr. Wilberforce projected, or took a zealous interest in, was the establishment of the Christian Observer; to the pages of which he was an occasional contributor, his time and eye-sight not allowing of his writing much for the press. Mr. Macaulay was about to make out for us a list of the papers of Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Venn, and some other writers in the earlier volumes, but his illness and decease prevented it. We find such occasional allusions in Mr. Wilberforce's diary and letters as the following:

"March 1801. Lord Castlereagh called and staid an hour and a half—about the state and prospects of Ireland and policy to be observed..... I fear my time is not enough improved. Writing on Bible—paper credit. Miscellaneous reading. At work on paper for Christian Observer—a retrospect of the last year."

"It has, you know, been matter of controversy (he says to Mrs. Hannah More, Sept. 7, 1802,) what degrees or kind of resemblance in the thoughts of different writers are proofs that the one has borrowed from the other. You may perhaps at first suspect some laying of heads together, when you read what I am about to propose to you—that you should lend your aid a little to the cause of the Christian Observer. I called on Henry [Thornton] last night, to state to him this my opinion, when I found that he had already written to you on the same subject. But as, where there is no servile imitation, as the critics hold, there will be diversities, so here I find Henry and I, agreeing in the main idea, had differed in the next link of the chain. He wished you, I find, to send us an account of Miss H. Bird's last hours. Nothing on that subject can at all equal the simple expression of your feelings on the spot. Never shall I forget the impression which it produced on my own heart when I first read it on a Sunday, the day after its arrival, at Mr. Grant's house in John Street. We, some of us, have that very paper, which, with a little explanation and supplement, would be the best mode of sending it forth.

"But my idea was, and is, that you should write some religious and moral novels, stories, tales, call 'em what you will, illustrative of character and principles. The Cheap Repository tales, a little raised in their subjects, are the very things I want; and I am persuaded, if you would thus give your aid, and I join mine, (which I will, if you will agree to furnish your complement,) we might at once greatly raise the character and increase the utility of the work. The truth is, it is heavy, and it will be heavy from the very nature of the case. If it be not enlivened it will sink, and you will hereafter regret that you refused to lend a helping hand to keep it above water. Do therefore think of what I say, and fall to work. Notwithstanding your ill health, you have no valid excuse for not taking up the pen, because you write with such facility. I who, without any false humility, must say the very opposite of myself, will yet fall to work when I know you have agreed to contribute. You must not refuse me.

"I have just looked at the last Number of the Anti-Jacobin. They are sinking fast, and already have such marks of death above them, that the Humane Society itself would scarce undertake to revive them."

"March 26th, 1802. Dined at home. Ludlam, Henry Thornton, Stephen, &c. Talked about Sierra Leone, and in the evening about Christian Ob-

server. Fixed Macaulay should take management. He, Pearson, and Babington with us."

"Your few little words, (he is writing to Mr. Macaulay in Sept. 1808) though so modestly put, cut me to the very quick—I mean your short question, 'How goes on the critique on Fox?' (for the Christian Observer). I am ashamed to say, it can scarcely be said to be begun, except that I have been reading a good deal, in order to refresh my memory on the events of that period. But I am grieved to think how the six weeks, for so long I have now been here, (East Bourne) have been employed—four-fifths of my time consumed in letter-writing. I can make to you the same sort of excuse which was made to a worthy friend of mine, rector of a parish in Norfolk, by a parishioner whom my friend had been reproving for never having come to church for a long period. 'Why to be sure,' replied the man, 'I have not come to church much, but I assure your honour I have gone no where else.'—So I can plead to you. But really, my dear friend, I find that it would take me a year's study, (not of such little broken periods as alone I now enjoy, but of real good days' work,) to make up my mind satisfactorily on even a part only of the many important facts and questions which come before any one who reviews the period between 1625, (Charles the First's beginning to reign,) and the Revolution. But I am resolved I will send you something, and therefore I must be content, and so must you, with a far less satisfactory and complete work than I should be glad to send."

"The promised review was soon afterwards supplied. It is full of valuable thought, though 'the most productive time' he could give up for composition was 'in the morning whilst dressing,' and many of the questions which he wished to solve were left untouched. 'I find there is no end of entering into a discussion of the questions started by Mr. Fox in the introductory chapter. Alps on Alps arise as one proceeds to investigate it. But I am disposed to give a little account of the party system, as Fox most broadly lays down the doctrine of his party, by condemning and grossly misapplying the dictum 'not men but measures.' Does it not however strike you (he says to Mr. Macaulay) that there is a certain philosophical spirit throughout, very hostile to the spirit of Christianity, as well as a manifest hatred—in him, poor fellow, but too natural—to the Church of England."

We have not given all the extracts we proposed; but we must defer the remainder to leave room for other matters.

OBITUARY.

THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS BURGESS, D.D., LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In our Number for last January we commenced a memoir of our late venerable friend, Bishop Burgess, but delayed the completion of it, hoping to have the advantage of the expected authentic memoir by Mr. Hartford, of Blaize Castle, the munificent benefactor to St. David's college, to whom the bishop left the disposition of his papers, in conjunction with Mrs. Burgess; with his wish expressed twelve months before his death, that if any life of him were published, Mr. Hartford should be the biographer. Mr. Hartford's work, however, not having yet appeared, we will not allow the last Number of our present volume to go out without the completion of our brief notice; though it will be shorter and more desultory than we had intended, as we hope to supply other particulars when the authentic memoir is published.

In our last paper we traced the bishop's early history up to the time of his becoming fellow and tutor of Corpus Christi College, and being admitted to holy orders. A friend, who knew him at that period, in writing to us, says: "He was greatly valued for his talents and assiduity in the sphere in which he moved, and much admired and esteemed by all persons interested in the promotion of sound and elegant literature at home and abroad: but his deportment was so modest, and his habits were so retiring, that his merit procured him much less public notice than others have attracted with much inferior pretensions. His acquaintance with Greek literature was acknowledged to be very

profound; but had he not fallen under the eye of Bishop Barrington, who had a peculiar pleasure in discovering and rewarding unambitious merit, his feet would probably have rarely stepped out of classic ground, and the walks of the Academy." Bishop Barrington made him his chaplain, and collated him, in 1787, to a prebend in Salisbury cathedral; and when he was translated to the See of Durham, he carried Mr. Burgess with him, and installed him in his cathedral there.

A circumstance which occurred during Mr. Burgess's residence with Bishop Barrington at Mongewell, as his lordship's chaplain, shews the decision and independence which, notwithstanding his diffidence of manner, marked his character. The bishop, on some occasion, had not treated him with the consideration due to his station and personal claims to respect. At that period he had not given up his rooms in college, although he rarely occupied them, except when he came to consult the libraries in the University. Without noticing what he considered reprehensible in the Bishop of Durham's demeanour, he mounted his horse, and riding over to Oxford, quietly resumed his station at Corpus, and resolved, rather than submit to what he considered an indignity, to forego every prospect of preferment, and to rely upon his own abilities and exertions for support; strenuously refusing the advice of all his friends to return to Mongewell, till Bishop Barrington, with a generosity of spirit that did him high honour, expressed his sincere regret at what had taken place, and himself earnestly solicited his return. At this moment Mr. Burgess's entire dependence for advancement was upon the Bishop of Durham, and in vindicating his station as Chaplain to the prelate, he ran a risk of ruining every worldly prospect. Happily for both parties, the one was anxious to repair, the other not desirous to resent, an injury which was unintentionally inflicted.

Mr. Burgess's next advancement took place under the administration of Mr. Addington, who had been his fellow-student at Winchester and Oxford, and who, unsolicited, conferred on him, in 1803, the vacant see of St. David's. A friend mentions to us, that Lord Sidmouth assured him that he was induced to select Mr. Burgess, by his conviction alone, without any application being made to him in his behalf, that his deep and sincere piety, coupled with his great attainments in sacred literature, qualified him above any other man to succeed to the dignity. The selection of fit persons to be recommended to deans and chapters for election for the episcopal office, has not always been so conscientiously made. Hannah More once told us, that she was one day congratulating Lord Sidmouth, that if his short-lived administration had done no other good, it had made Dr. Burgess a bishop; upon which his lordship replied, "Ah!—but we made Pelham too!" thus proving, that though private information and friendship happened to have fixed on a good bishop, family and political interest were quite as potent in foisting in a bad one. If anything shall, unhappily, overturn the Church of England, it will probably be this too frequent subjection of the episcopal office to the favouritism of courts and cabinets. Till the church has, if not the actual election of her spiritual rulers, which she ought to have, yet, at least, an effective veto upon unfit appointments, she will neither enjoy the prerogatives of a Christian society, nor be able to rise to the exigences of her actual condition.

From the moment of his elevation to the episcopal bench, the learned prelate displayed the most devoted and exemplary attention to the concerns of his diocese, and was unceasing in his efforts to benefit those placed under his jurisdiction. In so saying we do not mean that he was so thorough a man of business and detail as it is desirable a bishop of the Church of England should be. On the contrary, with the best wishes and intentions, and though personally self-denying and laborious, yet his addiction to various pursuits of biblical and ecclesiastical literature, to which he considered himself sacredly bound to devote much attention, and a habit of abstraction and frequent forgetfulness of passing scenes, are said to have diminished his efficiency as a prompt and active supervisor, as the name of his office implies. There was certainly an impression in his diocese, and elsewhere, that if his lordship happened to be engaged in some elaborate critical research, a communication upon current business might chance to be overlooked, or not be immediately replied to: so that it was playfully said, If you wished to ensure his lordship's opening your letter and sending a reply, you should write "1 John v. 7," on the outside. We think that the weak state of his lordship's eyes, which rendered writing and reading, especially manuscript, very painful to him, was often the cause of the alleged delays; and that some things being put off on this account, at the moment, were forgotten till he was reminded of them by

a second communication. We recollect, in looking over a list of the returns of the collections for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in 1819, that there was nothing from the diocese of St. David's, and, upon inquiring the cause, being told that his lordship had forgotten to send round the King's letter, and to give directions to his clergy upon the subject. We think it more probable, if no collection came in eventually, that his lordship considered that his own diocese required all that could be raised for religious objects—as we have heard him make that remark on some other occasion; but the story was considered characteristically probable, if not true.*

* We should scarcely have thought it necessary to allude to his Lordship's want of business habits, but that some correspondents thought us partial in not noticing it in our former remarks, as it detracted, they affirm, from his usefulness as a bishop. We certainly cannot say that, personally or editorially, we had any reason to complain of want of obliging attention in correspondence; but to be sure his communications with us were usually upon subjects within his own favourite departments of study; such as biblical literature; the affairs of the Church; the Socinian and Romanist controversies; not of course forgetting 1 John v. 7, and St. Paul's having visited Great Britain. We subjoin a few of these notes as a specimen. He was in frequent communication, by writing, or orally, with our work, of which he had been a reader, and an occasional correspondent, from the commencement.

The following take in every year from 1828 to 1833. They are but a sample.

"*Palace, Salisbury,*
Sept. 10, 1828.

"Dear sir,—You (or your correspondent in the Christian Observer) were quite right in expecting that Crito Cantabrigiensis' book, in vindication of Professor Porson, was not to be without a Reply. The inclosed Introduction is intended for persons who are not very conversant with the controversy respecting 1 John v. 7, but it is, if I mistake not, fully adequate for the vindication of the controverted verse. The Tract to which the inclosed is an Introduction, is printed, but not out of the printer's hands.

"I hope that Mrs. —— has perfectly recovered her health, and that you are quite well. I am, dear sir, yours very truly, T. Sarum."

In speaking, therefore, of the Bishop in his diocesan character, we referred rather to his large views and plans, and his indefatigable zeal in prosecuting

[*Feb.* 1829.]

"Dear sir,—I have here sent you the conclusion of my Reply to Crito Cantabrigiensis. In my Introduction, which the Christian Observer has very indulgently reprinted, [Oct. 1828, p. 610] I have stated the general evidence for the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. In this conclusion I have shewn the weakness of the strongest objections against it. The Tract will soon be out of the printer's hands; and as the Duke of Wellington's Bill [the Roman Catholic Relief Bill] will, I suppose, soon bring me to London, I shall have the pleasure of sending you an entire copy.

"I am, dear sir, yours very truly,
"T. Sarum."

"*Southampton, June* 1, [1830.]

"Dear sir,—I shall not be long without a copy of the Christian Observer Forty Family Sermons; I should be glad if I could say the same of [mentioning an Essay on the ministerial office, which he used to present to his candidates.] I hold an ordination on the 20th inst. (D. V.), and though it was my wish to have employed the candidates on the Essay, as well as on Burnet's Pastoral Care, yet if the new edition should be out before the 16th inst. it would be useful.

"Perhaps your friend may abate some of his hostility to 1 John v. 7, if you shew him the inclosed *fac-simile* of the verse, as it stands in the Codex Ottobonianus in the Vatican, which has been lately discovered. [We gave an accouut of the Ottoban MS. in our Number that month, p. 381. The friend alluded to was Mr. Hartwell Horne, who, we had told the Bishop, felt constrained to withdraw the opinion which he had formerly expressed in favour of the authenticity of the text; which the good Bishop construed into "hostility."] I beg your acceptance of it, and am, dear sir, yours very truly, T. Sarum."

"*Palace, Salisbury,*
Sept. 20, 1831.

"Dear sir,—In the Literary Intelligence of the last Number of the Christian Observer, p 507, there is a misreport, which deserves to be corrected. Miss Joanna Baillie's work is not in favour of Socinianism. She disclaims their doctrine as at variance with Scripture, and standing on no solid foundation. She is an Arian of Dr. Clark's

them, than to any particular aptitude for the details of daily business; though no prelate could be more anxious that all the arrangements of every parish in his diocese should be carefully adjusted; and we remember his once remarking

---

school. I have just printed an answer to her Tract. Copies will, in a few days, be forwarded to London; and I shall desire Mr. Hatchard to send you a copy. I have inclosed the title and contents. I am, dear sir, yours very truly. T. SARUM."

"*Palace, Salisbury, Nov.* 11, 1831.

"Dear sir,—The notice taken of my letter to Miss J. Baillie, in the Christian Observer, will materially promote the intended purpose of its publication.

"I am glad to hear that the abridgment of ——— is in the press; and that the Bishop of ——— recommends it for adoption by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

"St. Paul's visit to this island is one of my favourite subjects. I was lately in correspondence with Southey on the evidence which I have given of it, and was glad to have his concurrence, as thinking that it amounts to an historical proof.

"If I mistake not, I have not sent you a copy of an Appendix to my Tract, which I now inclose; in the note subjoined to it, you will see some remarkable coincidences relative to a Greek MS. which was only extant at Venice, that contained the disputed verse of St. John.

"One of the most fearful symptoms of the times is observable in the character of the parties, among the very high and the very low, most clamorous for reform, who have no respect for anything established, no knowledge of religion; and have no conception of the peculiar characteristics of the government under which they live.

"I am, dear sir, yours very truly,
"T. SARUM."

"*Palace, Salisbury, Dec.* 8, [1831.]

"Dear sir,—I thank you for the printed account which you sent me of Mr. ———'s sermon. I had frequently heard of the blasphemies of Irvingism, but I had never before, that I recollect, seen a printed authentic report of them. It must have been most painful and mortifying to you, to hear such doctrines from a pulpit which had been accustomed to the Gospel discourses of your excellent friend ——— and ———

"I am glad you approve of my endeavour to take out of the hands of the Unitarians the name and authority of Sir Isaac Newton. The learned and most estimable author whose biblical Notes you have reviewed in the last Number of the Christian Observer, was pleased with the Appendix, as well as with my Paraphrase of the disputed passage. I had lately a very interesting letter from Lord Grenville, with his entire approbation of my view of it.

"I enclose a beautiful little Tract, which I think you may not be likely to meet with. I am, dear sir, yours very faithfully, T. SARUM."

"*Palace, Salisbury, Dec.* 16, 1831.

"Dear sir,—The only alteration which I should wish to be made in my Appendix, is by the insertion of the words 'in the re-statement,' which I have written on the margin of the enclosed. The re-statement was shewn to me by a friend, who lent me Dr. Brewster's Life of Sir I. N., and I read his re-statement without being at all aware that Sir Isaac's suppression of his dissertation had been noticed in some preceding pages. The addition of the words *in the re-statement*, will prevent other readers falling into the same oversight which I did. The *previous* notice of the suppression neither lessens the injustice of the re-statement of suppressed opinions, nor the impropriety of omitting the notice in the re-statement. I am, dear sir, yours very truly,
"T. SARUM."

"*Palace Salisbury, Dec.* 17, 1831.

"Dear sir,—I am glad that the pages were printed off, as the only alteration wanted, is the addition of the words '*in the re-statement*,' as marked on the margin of the second copy, which I sent yesterday. I have subjoined the form of an Erratum. Yours very truly, T. SARUM."

"*Palace, Salisbury, Dec.* 24, [1831.]

"Dear sir,—Many thanks for indulging my curiosity, which was excited in more than an ordinary degree, to know by whom 'The Visit to a Cathedral' [in the Christian Observer for that year] was written. So much were my readers [his Lordship was obliged to get those about him to read to him, on account of his eyes] and myself interested in its contents—I frequently wished for a complete development of the half disclosed improvements in the Cathedral system

to us, that some of the ordinations which had given him most satisfaction, were those of officers of both services, after the termination of the war; for, said he, speaking of one of these individuals, he seems to consider his parish his ship, and walks it as he would the quarter-deck, knowing and regulating all its concerns, and keeping everything in admirable order.

Among the plans which we have alluded to, may be mentioned the institution of the diocesan "Church Union Society," and the establishment of St. David's College. The object of the Church Union Society was to distribute Bibles, Prayer Books, and Tracts among the poor; to establish libraries for the clergy; to facilitate the means of education to young men intended for holy orders; to encourage the establishment of English schools, and also of Sunday schools. These plans may not now seem very remarkable; but when Bishop Burgess proposed them in 1804, they bore the stamp of novelty almost as much as of utility. The bishop recommended each new incumbent to give one-tenth of a year's income to the institution, and he began by setting the example. He attached peculiar importance to that part of the plan which related to clerical education; there was a lamentable deficiency, he said, both of spiritual qualification and professional attainment, among the clergy, especially in Wales; and he endeavoured to awaken the attention of the church to both these subjects by proposing premiums for essays, some confined to his own diocese, others open to the members of Oxford and Cambridge, and the clergy generally. Among the latter there were four which were intended to form a series, though the bishop, we believe, printed only one of the set. The subjects were, 1. What is conversion? 2. Can a clergyman be an unconverted character? 3. What are the signs of conversion and unconversion in a clergyman? 4. How may an unconverted clergyman be best brought, by the blessing of God, to a sense of his sin and danger? These theses gave great offence in some quarters, as being calculated, it was said, to disparage the clergy in public opinion; but the bishop was upheld by the approbation of some of his reverend and right reverend brethren whom he consulted; among whom, if we mistake not, were Bishop Barrington, and Dr. Howley, then Regius professor of Divinity at Oxford.

To complete and perpetuate his plans, he projected St. David's College, since established at Lampeter. He proposed his plan, if we recollect rightly, as long back as the year 1807; in four or five years, he had raised 5000 pounds towards the object; but a much larger sum was needed; besides which, other impediments arose, so that the foundation was not laid till 1822, and the college was not opened till 1827. It has been admirably conducted, chiefly through the zealous exertions of its learned, able, and pious Vice-Principal, Dr. Ollivant; and has proved a great

---

which are suggested in it. I should be extremely obliged to the author, if I could prevail upon him to communicate to me, freely and fully, his ideas on the subject. [It was done in the Christian Observer for Feb. 1832.] I thank you for the enclosed sermon, which will be part of our reading this evening. I am, dear sir, yours very faithfully, T. Sarum."

"*Palace, Salisbury, Jan.* 17, 1832.

"Dear sir,—I hasten to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th, and its enclosure, though I have not read the printed page, nor deciphered the whole of your letter. Younger eyes shall do that for me to-morrow. [This shews the injustice of blaming the bishop because he did not always read and answer letters at the moment.] In the meanwhile you will oblige me by sending me another copy of the —— ——. Yours very sincerely, T. Sarum."

[We cannot find at the moment any other notes in 1832, except one or two more personally kind than necessary for publication. It was in that year that the letters on the Bible Society were addressed to him in our pages, with his cordial concurrence; and we need not say how warm an interest he took in the affairs of that Society, and its vindication from unjust charges. We will conclude with a note in 1833.]

"*Torquay, Dec.* 19, 1833.

"Dear sir,—I thank you for the extract which you have sent me from Le Protestant; and I request you to inform me whether this French work is published in England, and for whom; and what is its general object. It is delightful to see the evidence of Christianity brought home to our door by internal proofs of St. Paul's Western travels, and by the actual possession of the Alexandrine MS. of the Scriptures in the British Museum, which, by its antiquity, reduces the dispute about the truth of Christianity to the short period of four or five centuries. I am, dear sir, yours faithfully, T. Sarum."

blessing to the Principality. The bishop proposed a very large and liberal course of instruction, general and theological; but it would not be doing justice to his Lordship, did we not add, that though he entertained very exalted views of the importance of Hebrew and classical literature to a clergyman, no prelate could urge more strongly the necessity of those studies which directly bear upon personal religion and its practical operations. As we find that his Lordship's views have been misunderstood, as though he placed clerical proficiency chiefly in matters of criticism and controversy, we will quote a few remarks from a work which he printed in 1822; not for sale, but only to be "distributed as presents to a few friends," and which therefore is not easily accessible. The work was a Vindication of Bishop Cleaver's edition of the Lacedemonian decree against Timotheus; but the bishop digresses to defend Bishop Cleaver's list of books for the younger clergy against the "injustice" of Bishop Marsh; whose remarks, he says, "appear calculated to mislead the younger clergy, by confounding the order of their studies, and withdrawing their attention from what ought to be the first and last object of their ministry." Bishop Cleaver's classification, he says, leads the student to consider the obligations of his profession; "a strong sense of duty; devout feeling and personal religion; a decided conviction of the truth of Christianity; a thorough knowledge of the Scripture, its doctrines, its ordinances; and a zealous attachment to the church of which he is a member;" and hence "the study of professional duties; prayer; the evidences of the Gospel; daily study of Scripture, with comments and other subsidiary means; its doctrines; the ordinances of Christ and his apostles; and ecclesiastical history and law." He then animadverts upon Bishop Marsh's course; adding: "The knowledge of Christ, and of the means of man's salvation, should be the governing principles in Christian theology." His Lordship of course urges a due attention to critical studies; but he qualifies his remarks by saying: "But Providence has so mercifully taken care for our instruction in the great business of our salvation, that the important truths which most nearly concern us, are the least embarrassed with difficulties, and require none of the aids of elaborate philology." The ministerial student's whole course, he says, should be to qualify him for "his pastoral duties;" not merely to secure "literary and professional acquirements," but to "bring into exercise, and to perpetuate, those serious and interesting impressions under which he pledged himself to the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties on the day of his ordination."

The Bishop is understood to have repeatedly declined the offer of translation to a more lucrative see; till at length, in his latter years, finding the distance of St. David's from London very inconvenient to him, and other reasons combining, he, upon the death of Bishop Fisher of Salisbury, in 1825, accepted the nomination to that diocese, which had been procured for him upon the representation of the Bishop of Durham to Lord Liverpool. Throughout the twelve years during which he was spared to preside over the diocese of Salisbury, he laboured zealously, as he had done at St. David's, to improve the means of Divine worship, to correct neglect or irregularity, and to increase and nurture the flock committed to his charge. The extended range of his benevolence was attested not only in the munificence of his contributions to public works of charity, but in the unobtrusive deeds of private almsgiving, and in the prosecution of any good and useful work.

As our own intercourse with our revered friend was literary and general, not official, we will confirm and enlarge our estimate by the testimy of two individuals in his own diocese, who had ample local opportunities of observing him in the sphere of his spiritual jurisdiction; and whose own character, for piety and sound judgment, gives weight to their opinion.

The venerable the archdeacon of Salisbury (Mr. Lear), in his Charge at his primary visitation, observes:

"I should be deemed wanting by all who hear me, and great the restraint I should lay on my own feelings, were I not to pay a sincere, though necessarily a brief, tribute of respect to the memory of the learned and excellent Prelate lately removed from amongst us. In his death we have to lament the loss of a Diocesan of no common worth. He was, as a man, simple in manners, kind in heart, firm of purpose; as a Bishop, learned and conscientious, generous in disposition, and paternal in conduct; as a Christian, humble and sincere, deeply conscious of man's insufficiency, and warmly thankful for gospel salvation. Bright and steady as the light which was in him shone, even to his latest days, with us it was but as that of the declining sun: here he spent the evening of his years. In order to form a fair estimate of his character, and judge rightly of what the energies of that character really were, we must go to

his former Diocese; it was there the real vigour of his mind was displayed; it was there he shewed himself so powerful a defender of the faith for which he contended, and the Church he loved; and it was there he was the honoured instrument of founding and perfecting an establishment which will perpetuate his memory, and make his name honourable to the latest generations. Nor in this diocese will his venerated name be left without witness."

The Very Reverend the Dean of Salisbury (Dr. Pearson) in like manner attests:

"How sincerely our late venerable bishop was beloved and revered, I need scarcely say. The feeling of attachment and respect to his memory is universal; and I am happy in having this opportunity, which I cannot but deem peculiarly appropriate, of adding my grateful testimony to that of so many others, to the various graces and virtues of his character. To the talents and the learning of our late excellent diocesan; to his inflexible integrity and consistency, both of principle and conduct; to his public spirit, and his patriotic love of all our ancient, and especially our ecclesiastical, institutions; to his disinterestedness and liberality; to his active benevolence and diffusive charity; to the kindliness of his affections, and the sweetness of his manners,—a just and general tribute has been, and will continue to be, paid. The subject which we have been considering rather leads me to speak of the Christian character of our late venerable bishop, and of that faith and hope which have been completed and realised in the happiness of a future world. His reliance on his Saviour's merits for pardon and acceptance in the sight of God, was simple and sincere. Blameless, and abundant as he was in every good work, he depended for salvation only on the atonement of Jesus Christ. This gave peace to his conscience, and enabled him to rejoice 'in hope of the glory of God.' He truly loved his Redeemer, and earnestly desired the extension of his kingdom. He was 'a lover of good men,' and delighted in their society. He was a father and friend to the poor. He was spiritually minded, which is 'life and peace.' How fervently he desired, and how diligently he pursued, the perfection and the happiness of a higher world; those who conversed with him most confidentially and unreservedly best know. He aspired to the communion of prophets and apostles, of saints and angels, and more than all, to a nearer and more intimate approach to 'God the Judge of all,' and to 'Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant.' The anticipation of this blessed and glorious termination of his earthly course cheered him amidst the infirmities of age, and the prospect of the grave. His faith triumphed over the last great enemy; and he is, doubtless, now safe in the resting-place of the spirits of the just."

From these notices of the bishop, in his pastoral and private character, we ought now to proceed to speak of him as a writer, in which capacity he was chiefly known to the public. But here we can only pen a few brief remarks; for our space would not allow of our doing justice to the literary history of one whose life was literature, in its connection with objects of morality, piety, and philanthropy. We have in our possession a list of more than a hundred of his publications; and he once told us that he believed he had scarcely ever, during many years, been in any place for three months without issuing some publication from it; often from the local press, as the rude typography of some of his works bears witness. Many of his earlier productions were classical, and indicated great taste, learning, and critical research; others were elementary, for the instruction of children, down to a Sunday-school spelling book: others were tracts for the poor, such as his "Friendly advice to servants and apprentices;" others were written for biblical students, with an especial view to revive and extend the study of Hebrew; some were theological, others ecclesiastical, and others historical; besides his sermons and Charges; and his well-known controversial publications on Popery, Socinianism, and sacred criticism. The list alone would occupy many pages.

Among his early publications, there is one which ought not to be forgotten, as it places him very high indeed in the ranks of that honoured band of Christian patriots and philanthropists by whose exertions the slave-trade and ultimately slavery were abolished. As long back as the year 1789, Mr. Burgess had the courage to publish a volume, entitled, "Considerations on the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, upon grounds of natural, religious, and political duty." Thus early did this humane and enlightened man chain and brand slavery and the slave-trade together, and demand the extinction of both. The book, we doubt not, was very effective at the time—for it was written with great ability, and with bold, uncompromising animation; but it had been lost sight of for more than thirty years, when at the commencement of the late arduous anti-slavery contest, the writer of the present remarks happened to be making some explorations at the British Museum, and accidentally found a copy of it; and

resuscitated it, as an invaluable treasure at that moment, both from the weight of its arguments, and the high character of the writer. We in consequence alluded to it, (March 1823, page 197,) in mentioning the presentation to Parliament, of a petition for the abolition of Slavery, by Mr. Wilberforce, when that veteran Christian philanthropist, finding his health unable to bear the fatigue of the contest,—"for a contest," we forebodingly and too truly remarked, "we fear it will be,"—resigned the leadership to Mr. Buxton, who in May following opened the first campaign of that memorable struggle. Next year (Oct. 1824, p. 621—633); we give the references, in case any of our readers should wish for a fuller account of the bishop's publication,) we drew up an analysis of its arguments, with extracts from its indignant eloquence; and no publication was more serviceable than these passages from Bishop Burgess, in reply to those clergymen and others, who upheld slavery on the ground that it is a Divine institution. When so many of our reverend brethren were calling us from month to month, it was consoling to us to be able to refer to the long expressed and unretracted opinion of this venerable Father in the church, that slavery was not a civil institution to be ameliorated, but a sin, a crime, an atrocity to be extirpated; ("which oppression," said Mr. Burgess, "must be swept away at one blow;") and to shew that this was no new opinion, but was the settled conviction of the early abolitionists, who contemplated nothing short of the extinction of slavery itself, as the goal of their exertions. In reply to those who defended West India slavery, as "a dispensation of Providence," the bishop had said: "Many attacks have been made on the authority of Scripture, but nothing would more effectually subvert its authority than to prove that its injunctions are inconsistent with the common principles of benevolence, and inimical to the general rights of mankind. It would degrade the sanctity of Scripture; it would reverse all our ideas of God's paternal attributes, and all arguments for the Divine origin of the Christian religion drawn from its precepts of universal charity and benevolence." He, in conclusion, entreated persons "of all ranks, professions, and persuasions," to unite in imploring the legislature, "in the name of the common Father of mankind; in the name of Him who died to save us all; in the name of faith, of charity, and of liberty; to extirpate a system of cruelty and oppression which has been so long suffered to exist, to the dishonour of human nature, the discredit of a Christian nation, of a generous and enlightened people, and the disgrace of a free constitution." His Lordship happily lived to witness the prospective consummation of this glorious object which he had so forcibly urged nearly half a century before.

We have written so often and so largely during many years upon his Lordship's Anti-Romanist and Anti-Socinian publications, that we less regret that we have not space at present to dilate upon them. We may say the same of his works in defence of the Bible Society; in one of which, in reply to Mr. Norris, of Hackney, he revived that memorable aphorism of Chillingworth, which had been long forgotten, but which has since become a golden proverb, that "The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants."

His Lordship's persevering vindication of the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, has, in the judgment of most scholars, only strengthened the proofs that the passage is surreptitious; nor have his arguments, to shew that St. Paul visited our island, been generally considered conclusive.

Among the bishop's publications we recollect a little waistcoat-pocket tractate, which he presented to us in 1819, but which not having had much circulation, and his Lordship's name not being on the title-page, is probably known to very few, even of his friends. It was entitled, "An easy way, by one duty, to serve Religion, to double your income, and to prolong life; or devotion, frugality, and health promoted by the observance of Lent; to which are added extracts from the works of the Rev. W. Jones, Lessius, Cornaro, and Cheyne." The object of the tractate was to recommend constant temperance and occasional fasting; and what he urged he practised. He considered the church days of abstinence useful, not only spiritually but physically; his own diet was always extremely simple; he had a distaste for wine, and an abhorrence of ardent spirits; he attributed his comparative health in advanced years to his practice of the rules of strict temperance; and we have heard him reason, though in vain, with an elderly clergyman, now deceased, upon the manifold evils of a custom to which he had addicted himself, of taking, once a day, a small quantity of ardent spirits, largely diluted with water: one of the bishop's arguments, we remember, being, that as the digestive powers decay in age, they ought to be less taxed; and that an old man should not try to keep up

his vigour by stimulants, but by simple nourishing diet, like a child, and avoiding all unnecessary expenditure. The church fasts he observed, not rigidly but with considerate abstinence; but we remember his once telling us, at nearly nine o'clock on a Sunday evening, after evening service, that he had not dined; for though Sunday is a festival, not a fast, yet he had adopted the practice of taking his chief repast in the evening, to prevent being drowsy at church. We ought, perhaps, to add, lest from his practice, or the title of his little book, it should be thought that his abstinence was in a spirit of formalism or pharisaism, that he one day in Lent requested us to give a leg of mutton for him to some poor old woman, as that would have been his dinner; but, he added, in allusion to a theological conversation, "Mind, I do not put it in the place of the doctrine of justification by faith." As he was a slavery abolitionist by anticipation, so he was also a temperance advocate.

But besides the bishop's separate publications, he wrote various detached papers; among which we would mention, for the information of such of our readers as might like to turn to it, an interesting historical and philological account of Granville Sharp's doctrine of the Greek article, for Mr. Prince Hoare's memoir of that Christian scholar and philanthropist.

Among his Lordship's various endeavours to promote sound learning, we may mention his planning the "Society of Literature," of which he was the founder and first president. Hannah More, in writing of it to Sir W. Pepys, in December 1820, says: "You have heard of the Royal Society of Literature. Another of my old and dear friends, the Bishop of St. David's (himself, I believe, one of the first scholars on the bench,) has been corresponding with me on the subject. The King is patron, and his patronage will be large. Now as learning is the next best thing to Religion, I hope the scheme may succeed. I have but one objection to it. Among the honorary members, they propose to include a few females. They have done unworthy me the honour to name me; I have written a strong remonstrance, declining the distinction, partly on the ground that I have no claim to it, but chiefly that I consider the circumstance of sex alone a disqualification." We do not know whether H. More, or any other of the early or present members of the Society, were aware of what led the bishop to project it. The date of its formation will shew that it was founded at a period of extreme peril, when, in consequence of the disturbances respecting Queen Caroline, there was much cause for apprehension; even the city of London having presented an address to the throne, which the king was advised severely to rebuke, as calculated to increase the popular ferment. In conversing with the good bishop one day on the alarming state of public affairs, he told us that he had contrived a scheme for "*making the king popular*;" (those were his words,) and he went on to shew the honour which Louis XIV. derived from the panegyrics of the Royal Academy; and he thought that if a somewhat similar institution were formed in England, under the king's patronage, it would not only tend to the promotion of literature, which it was a national opprobrium that the government of the country does not patronize, but would also engender strong feelings of dutiful attachment to the sovereign; the members, officers, and beneficiaries of the institution considering him their friend and patron. The king entered heartily into the scheme, (little thinking that it was to make him popular,) for he was a lover of literature, and had himself on many occasions promoted its interests. He had, for instance, given two gold medals to Winchester College in 1796; for English composition; he had munificently promoted the unrolling and deciphering of the Herculaneum manuscripts; he requested the present Bishop of Winchester to translate Milton's treatise "De Doctrina," which had been discovered in the State Paper office; he gave his father's magnificent library to the British Museum; he also presented £1000 to St. David's college, accompanied by a truly elegant and eulogistic letter to the Bishop, a *fac simile* of which is now before us; and he was also a munificent annual subscriber to the Society of Literature; but the good bishop did not rightly distinguish between the state of France in the seventeenth century, and that of England in the nineteenth, when he formed his estimate of what he thought might be effected in the promotion of literature by the sunshine of court favour; much less would he listen to the obvious remark that in a nation which boasts of at least ten thousand living authors, a pension to half a score, and those not all of them popular favourites, would not envelope the king with a cloud of literary incense.

(*Concluded in the Appendix.*)

APPENDIX

TO THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER, FOR 1838,

BEING THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE NEW SERIES.

RELIGIOUS AND MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

OUR LORD'S FAREWELL DISCOURSE.

For the Christian Observer.

OUR Lord's farewell discourse, before his crucifixion, is recorded by St. John in the sixteenth, and the two chapters of his gospel which precede it; his great intercessory prayer for the church, in the chapter which immediately follows. His object, as he himself states it, is to prepare the minds of his disciples for his approaching departure; and this he does by a detailed enumeration of the *sufferings* which they would have to encounter, and the *supports* which he would minister to them. The former he sums up in the second verse of the sixteenth chapter. He there tells them, that they would have to undergo every persecution which every authority, ecclesiastical or civil, could inflict. By the one they should be excommunicated; by the other slain. "They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." He would have them enter upon their Christian profession with seriousness and consideration, that they might carry it through with perseverance. Before they commenced to build that tower whose top should reach unto the heavens, he would have them soberly calculate whether they were prepared for that expenditure of every earthly hope and comfort which would be required for its completion. Before they entered upon that warfare in which there could be no quarter or compromise, he would have them consider whether they were willing to endure those hardships and privations which were necessary, in order to bring the conflict to a successful and glorious issue.

On the other hand, he tells them of the resources on which they might, with certainty, calculate: the present influences of his Spirit, which would support and cheer them: the peace amid tribulations: the joy irradiating sorrow: the Divine power over sin: the hope full of immortality. He tells them of the motives which the future supplied for their encouragement: the many mansions of their Father's house: the crown of righteousness prepared for him that overcometh.

Thus he brings into strong contrast the sufferings of this present time, and the glory that should be revealed, that they may soberly weigh time against eternity, or rather the world against God: that they may compare the light afflictions of the people of God, which are but for a moment, with that far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory which awaits them: and that, applying to this all-important subject the exercise of a calm and sober judgment, they may, on *both* sides, "count the cost."

He had not hitherto entered upon these subjects in such detail, because he was yet with them, and the angel of his presence guided, comforted, and guarded them. While he was with them, he was their shield as well as their Counsellor; and every arrow of persecution was levelled against him alone. The difference of dispensation, in this respect, under which our Lord and his disciples were placed during his sojourn upon earth, can be accounted for only by the difference of spirit which then animated them. While Christ was in the field, Satan commissioned the spirit of persecution to fight neither with small nor great, but only with the King of Israel. While our Lord's whole life, from his cradle to his cross, was a continued series of persecutions; while he was frequently compelled, until his hour was come, to withdraw himself, even by miracle, from the hand of violence; from the rage of Herod; from the treachery of the Scribes and Pharisees; and from the madness of the people; we find the disciples moving on in undisturbed security, beneath the shadow of his wing. The very faults of the disciples were transferred to him: "Why do thy disciples that which it is not lawful to do?" "Why do thy disciples fast not?" Thus the reproaches of those that reproached them fell upon him. It is true that they had forsaken all and followed him, and that he sent them forth without purse, or scrip, or shoes: but his overruling Providence ministered to all their wants: and while their Master was often wearied with journeyings; while often, hungry and thirsty, his soul fainted within him, they, upon their own testimony, lacked nothing. While Jesus was in an agony, his disciples slept in peace: while Jesus was bound, and buffeted, and mocked, and spit upon, and scourged, his disciples forsook him, and fled into undisturbed security. While Jesus poured forth his soul in anguish upon the accursed tree, his disciples stood afar off.

But now the days were coming when the Bridegroom should be taken from them, and then should they mourn in those days. And lest the weight of suffering, coming upon them unawares, should stagger or overwhelm their weak faith; lest the offence of the cross, unexpectedly encountered, should impede their progress, if not present an insurmountable obstacle to their Christian course, He fully details to them their discouragements and helps. Thus their sufferings, predicted, would but strengthen their faith in his Omniscience, and their confidence in his power to communicate the promised aid. But, for the present, this announcement overwhelmed them with surprise and consternation; sorrow filled their hearts.

This sorrow, doubtless, in part arose from the consideration that they were about to lose their Beloved Master, and that, too, by a cruel and ignominious death; and so far, though unenlightened and unsanctified, was legitimate, and even amiable. But, doubtless, it still more arose from the total prostration of all their worldly and ambitious hopes. They clung, with all the tenacity of the natural heart,

to those carnal views of the glories of the Messiah's kingdom which were prevalent among the Jews, and to which a grossly literal interpretation of the figures of prophecy gave birth. From those dreams, neither our Lord's spirit, doctrines, nor express declarations could awaken them. They had been faithful to him in his humiliation and adversity; they had continued with him in his temptations; and fully calculated upon those posts of trust, and dignity, and emolument which they should fill, when he restored again the kingdom to Israel. They had forsaken all to follow him; and were even ready to ask, "What shall we have therefore?" and to "dispute among themselves which of them should be the greatest" in the Messiah's kingdom.

The present humiliation and obscurity of their Master presented no check to the indulgence of their ambitious hopes. They had been trained in the daily contemplation of similar events, as recorded and attested facts. As Jews, their religion and their history were identical; and that history was a history of miracles. In it the Divine Mind and Arm were but sometimes, and then slightly, veiled by the human instrumentalities through which God worked among them the counsels of his will. Sense often saw—the weakest faith could never fail to see—the Lord sitting upon his throne in Zion, and his train filling the temple, and his will and arm wielding the sceptre of Jewish Theocracy. If, for the punishment of their sins, God would bring upon his people the hosts of the oppressor, and carry them away captives into the land of bondage; there to labour amid the fires of Egypt; or by the waters of Babylon to sit down and weep, while at heart-sinking distance they remembered Zion: if he would turn again their captivity, and avenge them of their adversaries: if he would transfer sovereignty from the mighty monarch to the obscure peasant, as he followed his ewes great with young, or from one nation to another people, bursting the gates of brass, and breaking the bars of iron in sunder; whatever was the purpose of the Divine mind, the moment the predicted crisis arrived, the moment the finger of God pointed upon the dial of prophetic Scripture to the set time, a secret spring brought into action a divinely constructed mechanism, which suddenly struck sounds of encouragement and confidence to the people of God, of terror and dismay to his enemies: "The elements, as by a kind of harmony, ranged themselves upon the side of God's people: the stars in their courses fought against his enemies: the waters stood upon an heap: the sun delayed his going down: the windows of heaven were opened, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up: the breath of the destroying angel selected, with nice discrimination, the first-born victim, or passed, with promiscuous, unsparing slaughter, over the sleeping host. The weakest human agents became mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strong holds: instruments the most contemptible, nay ludicrous, but for the Divine power which they manifested, and which was evidently made perfect in their weakness, operated the most glorious and amazing results: the rod of Moses—the ark of the covenant—the mouth of Elijah, could divide the waters: the uplifted arm of Moses, not with the weapons and shout of war, but with the attitude and accents of persevering prayer, could rout Amalek. The stripling's sling could prostrate the giant's strength: nay, the ram's horns could prostrate the walls of the fenced city; and the ass's jaw-bone slay its thousands. Why then should the Jew—and, oh! let me add still more why should the Christian—under

whatever disadvantages and discouragements of circumstances, distrust God? Why should he not in hope believe against hope, and say, "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

The disciples were intimately conversant with the prophecies relating to the Messiah's kingdom. These, in a strain of inspired sublimity, announced the advent of a great Deliverer of his people, who should subdue all their enemies under their feet; establish his throne upon the ruins of every rival; introduce a reign of righteousness, peace, and glory; and of whose kingdom there should be no end. These spiritual blessings, they, as does every natural heart, understood carnally. They believed Christ to be the Messiah which should come. They witnessed his daily miracles of mercy and benevolence; and justly calculated, that if that same Divine power which was exercised at the call of charity, and which tracked his course with blessings, were to become obedient to the voice of ambition; if He were to put forth his power for his own aggrandisement, no human force could withstand him: no enemy could take the field against *Him* whose resources and supplies were creation; whose power was Omnipotence; whose wisdom Omniscience. And therefore they were in daily expectation that he would burst forth from this clouded dawn, as often does the natural day, in the meridian blaze of glory: that the Deity would move within him; that the God would arise, and all his enemies be scattered; and that they who hated him should flee before him.

Proportioned to those high expectations was their profound disappointment and dismay, when Christ announced to them that his kingdom was not of this world; that as the world hated him it should hate them also: that their past trials and privations were but the earnest of those persecutions and sufferings for his name's sake which they should have yet to encounter, and which should be terminated but by a violent and ignominious death.

Doubtless, the consternation and astonishment with which his attached followers met this explicit announcement of their future destiny, must not only have filled with sorrow their own hearts, but also have been a deep and severe trial to the sensitive bosom of their loving Master. Yet his announcement contained within it a redeeming consolation and support. He went his way to Him that sent him; but in the stupor of carnal sorrow they had not ears to hear, or eyes to see, or a heart to understand, the superabounding compensation which this announcement contained, "None of them asked Him, Whither goest thou?" This question, put by a prepared mind, would have furnished a text from which he would have expatiated upon the peculiar and pre-eminent glories of his kingdom, and exhibited to them the privileges of his people in time, and their transcendant blessedness in eternity. He would have said, Weep not for me: I go to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God. Do not become adversaries to me, while in the view of my painful and ignominious death, you cry with misdirected feeling, Far be it from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee. You are they who would perpetuate my humiliation, while with fond embraces you would detain me. Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father.' Ought not Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? Ought he not to conquer principalities and powers, and to make a shew of them openly, triumphing over them upon the cross? Ought he not to conquer the

last enemy, death, and him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil? Ought he not to ascend up on high, leading captivity captive? Ought he not to resume that robe of light, and crown of glory, and form of majesty, and throne that endureth for ever, and sceptre that sways the universe, and kingdom that ruleth over all, and fellowship and equality with the Father, of which he emptied himself, when he took upon him the form of a servant, and was found in fashion as a man?

'And is it not expedient for you that I go away, that I may complete the sufferings of atonement, and the work of redemption, and bring in an everlasting righteousness; that I may plead for you at the throne of grace, and be your advocate with the Father; that I may purchase and send to you that Paraclete, who shall more than compensate the straitened energies of my bodily presence; who, while I plead for *you* with the Father, shall plead for *me* in your hearts; who shall convince you of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; who shall guide you into all truth, bringing all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you; who shall comfort you in all your sufferings for righteousness sake; counsel you in all your difficulties, and be unto you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist; who shall sanctify you through the truth, and shed abroad in your heart that peace of God which passeth all understanding; not only the peace of pardon, but the peace of holiness; not only the peace which results from having submitted wholly to the righteousness of God,—to that arrangement of infinite wisdom by which God can be just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly; and from having brought into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; but also the peace which results from having, through grace, conquered sin, crucified the old man, with its affections and lusts, and trampled Satan under your feet, that great enemy of God, of happiness, and of souls?'

But none of them asked him, Whither goest Thou? They saw but the dark cloud of present affliction, and saw not that it was about to burst in the refreshing showers of heaven-descending blessings upon their heads; therefore sorrow filled their hearts. And thus it is, that not only the men of this world, but even the people of God, too often grieve his Holy Spirit, when, in mercy, he chastens them for their good, that they may be partakers of his holiness. They faint, if not repine, under the chastening, instead of asking, in a spirit of humility and penitence, Wherefore dost Thou contend with me? instead of scanning the life, and probing the heart, and asking, Whence comest thou? and whither goest thou? Trouble cometh not from the dust; God does not grieve or afflict, willingly, the children of men. It is only, if needs be, that we are in heaviness through manifold temptations. To ask of an affliction, Whence comest thou? may well silence every murmur. To ask, Whither goest thou? what is thy gracious design? to what object dost thou tend? may well teach the believing soul to glory in tribulations also. It is the privilege of the believer, under any afflictive dispensation, to see the hand of an omnipotent God, whose unsleeping providence overrules all things, and has numbered the very hairs of his head, dealing out to him his sufferings by weight and measure, with the heart of a loving Father. It is his privilege to know that all things work together for good to them that love God; that, under every trial, his wisdom and security, as

well as his duty, is to cultivate a deeper love to God; for then he need not fear, though the mountains be removed, and the hills be carried into the midst of the sea. It is his wisdom, as well as his duty, to pray, that this refining process may be sanctified to his soul's health, rather than removed, perhaps in total abandonment, or wrath.

Beneath the tempest-tossed surface of our worldly interests and natural feelings, there flows an under-current which bears upon eternity. Divine Grace would maintain in all God's people an interior and spiritual life, of whose relation and bearing upon the various circumstances of our natural life, we are almost wholly ignorant; but God knows them, and it is as the index of this current sinks or rises, it is as the pulse of this spiritual life beats quick and feverish, or even and tranquil, that God gives or withdraws those temporal comforts, which that Physician of the soul, who knoweth whereof we are made, and has dissected, or rather created, all its spiritual anatomy, knows to be useful or prejudicial to it. We know not *ourselves*, and therefore we know not what we should pray for as we ought. Our prayers then, and our desires—for we should desire nothing for which we dare not pray—should be offered in this spirit, "not my will but thine be done;" and with this limitation, that God would bestow upon us, not what we most desire, but what his wisdom sees to be most expedient for us.

The Apostles would have retained Christ, and by holding him back from his atoning sacrifice, would, with him, have retained the wrath of God abiding upon them. They would have held by present hopes, and present gratifications, and lost the Comforter, and lost eternity. And who is there that ever soberly reflects upon the past, and will not admit that had he been the caterer of his own destiny; had every desire been obtained, he would, in numberless instances, have drawn down upon himself misery and ruin, not only as it respects eternity, but also as respects this life? Who cannot look back upon some seeming good, which once he earnestly implored and struggled to obtain, and which he will now acknowledge was refused in mercy? Who cannot look back upon some seeming evil, which once he earnestly but vainly deprecated, but which he will now acknowledge was sent by love, and has been the fruitful source of his richest blessings and comforts? Who cannot testify, if happily, not in his own experience, at least from a review of the experience of others, that often has the object of intensest affection, of most ardent expectation, and most sanguine hope, cast its darkest shade upon the path of life, and become the minister of keenest and most protracted suffering; while the dense and alarming thunder cloud, which launched its angry bolt, and struck some valued object, has subsequently descended in reviving and gladdening showers; or the clouded and gloomy dawn has been lit up at the meridian with sudden glory, or gradually brightened into a calm and placid evening, rich in the promise of a glorious coming day?

Pause at any moment in this span of life. Look back upon its past—look onwards to its future; and then seriously ask, What has the world already done for me? How has it fulfilled the promises with which it seduced my youthful heart? Has it satisfied those ardent aspirations after happiness which Creative Love implanted in my soul, and which point to God? And what is the world willing, what is it able still to do for me? Whence are its resources? Whence

are the materials and the powers by which it can first regenerate the wasted energies and affection of the heart, and then satisfy them? No. There is no object of hope or fear which earth can furnish, whose attainment or avoidance can compensate the disturbance of that peace of God which passeth all understanding, and which, but for those distracting objects, would preside in deep serenity over the soul. The object of pursuit, when stripped of the delusive colouring with which, in the hurry of the chace, imagination invested it, may prove a dagger to pierce the heart, or only a phantom to deceive it; but if we would escape, not only the temptations of this sinful world, but the sorrows of this troublesome world, we must be enabled, in one degree, to say, as did our blessed Lord in the view of his approaching conflict with the powers of darkness, The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me,—no earth-bedded root of bitterness—no worldly affection, upon which to graft whether sin or misery.

J. M. H.

RELINQUISHED MISSIONS:—FIRST MORAVIAN MISSION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

(*Continued from p.* 739.)

We left the missionary Schmidt transcribing an extract from the instructions sent out to him by Count Zinzendorf, in consequence of the persecution which had broken out against them. It is not necessary to the biography of Schmidt, that we should digress into a discussion of the points at issue between the early Moravians and their Protestant brethren; but the following extract from a letter written by David Nitschmann to Leonard Dober, in 1739, will shew how the proceedings bore upon the South African mission. He writes:

"The Circular against us (issued by the Ecclesiastical Council, in Amsterdam, in 1738,) has been published here far and wide. I have talked myself hoarse about it. We have been before the Governor and the Clergy; the latter were much irritated against Schmidt by the Circular; but, since our 'Declaration' was put into their hands, they have been pacified. Dear Brother, what a wide field of labour is South Africa! When will the Lord send his messengers to the Caffres also, who are Brother Schmidt's neighbours? What thousands are *there*, who must likewise become the Saviour's property. He will Himself make way for us; for the work will not be confined to the Hottentots alone. It is my conviction that our Brethren will yet be settled amongst them in blessing. My heart leaps when I hear them named. —— Schmidt is held in great respect both among the Hottentots and the colonists; the latter say, that he has made more impression on the Hottentots than any one else has done in 30 years, for they are now seen retiring to pray in secret. He only waits for assistance to extend his labours to the Caffres. You will weigh the whole matter before the Lord. May our Saviour shew compassion to this poor, despised, and scattered race!"

We now proceed with Schmidt's auto-biographical journal:

"In December, 1739, a Dutch farmer paid me a visit, and gave me a particular account of the Caffres, who live some hundreds of miles up the interior, and into whose country he had twice travelled. He described them as more industrious than the Hottentots, being an agricultural and settled tribe, living in huts. Their language, too, is less barbarous than that of the Hottentots; they are a lively, cheerful, and intelligent race, rich in cattle, with a fertile soil, and fine woods. Yet, though a large and numerous tribe, they live without God, in all the ignorance of heathenism.

"In February, 1740, my dear friend, Corporal Kampen, whom I was happy to visit during his illness with the consolations of the Gospel, departed to the Lord. A serjeant, of the name of Martinsen, succeeded him, and I soon became intimate with him likewise. He learned to love the Lord sincerely, and we lived together

as brethren. Nor was he remiss in testifying to the Hottentots of the reconciliation through the blood of Jesus, which he had so blessedly experienced himself.

"February 26th, 1741, the Brethren Nitschmann and Eller returned from Ceylon, and I again spent upwards of a week with them very pleasantly before they proceeded on their way to Europe.

"On the 31st March, 1742, as I was returning with William from Cape-Town, I asked him, whether he wished to be baptized, to which he replied in the affirmative. I then explained to him the meaning and obligations of that sacred rite. On coming to a running stream, I dismounted from my horse, knelt down with him, and prayed. I then put to him the following questions:—'Dost thou believe that the Son of God died on the cross for the sins of all mankind? Dost thou believe that thou art by nature a lost and undone creature? Wilt thou renounce the Devil and all his works? Art thou willing, in dependence on God's grace, to endure reproach and persecution, to confess Christ before all men, and to remain faithful to Him unto death?'—To all which he severally answered, 'Yes.' I then made him step into the water, and baptized him in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and gave him the name of Joshua. April 2nd, I took Brother Josbua und Africo into my chamber, where we knelt down and prayed together; after which I put the same question to Africo, and receiving the same answer, I baptized him also by the name of Christian. A few days after, I baptized Kibbodo by the name of Jonas, and two Hottentot women, who received the names of Magdalena and Christina.

In a letter of May 15th, 1742, Schmidt wrote to Mr. Isaac Le Long of Amsterdam:

"You will see from my diary, that I have baptized 5 Hottentots, whom I should now like to instruct in singing.—As to my circumstances here, you may represent me as one who has four years already been keeping solitary watch for his Lord, without being relieved, and who has vowed fidelity to Him to the last drop of his blood. The Lord reposes great confidence in me; and suffers me to struggle single-handed against His enemies. But He is faithful, and what He haa promised He also will perform. I will therefore remain under his banner, keeping patient watch. He knows that I desires nought but Him, and that I count not my life dear unto myself. I want no rest for the flesh, so long as my feet will carry me; but gladly leave my resting time to the end of my warfare. If I fall in the battle, so be it! To me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain. I believe that he has marked me out my work, and my times are in his hands.—Do you, my dearly beloved Brother, what lies in your power, and as the Lord shall direct, to procure me helpers in my work. May the sacred blood of Jesus overstream us every day and hour.

"When it became known at Cape-Town, that I was baptizing the Hottentots, it produced great sensation, being something quite new, and some of the clergy were very wroth about it. Joshua and Christian were summoned to appear before them. On being questioned as to their faith, they answered—'We believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' 'Right,' said their examiners, who then bid them read out of the New Testament. Accordingly they selected the third chapter of the gospel of St. John. The presiding minister now told them to adhere to what their teacher taught them, and dismissed them in peace. The text of the day was—'*Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings.*' (Isaiah li. 7).

September 13th, Schmidt wrote again to Le Long:

"Satan begins to rage, because I have proceeded to baptize my Hottentots. They expected me to bring them to Cape-Town for the clergy to baptize them there, and finding themselves deceived in their supposition, they are irritated against me. They are writing to the Consistory in Amsterdam regarding my right to administer the sacraments. I intend to await the answer, and if it does not leave me at liberty, you may soon expect to see me. They want to have the honour of my work; but they will not get it, for it belongs not to them, but to the Lord alone."

February 8th, 1743, he wrote as follows to the congregation at Herrnhaag:

"Dear Brethren! I greet you with a heart filled with love to you, and thank you for your kind remembrance. Think of me still in your prayers, for I greatly

need them, unworthy as I am. Gladly would I fulfil the whole pleasure of my Lord and his Church, in the post where He has graciously fixed my station. But there are two things which make life a burden to me; one is, the stony heart and the unbelief of my poor people; the other, my continued loneliness. In addition to this, the enemy spares no pains to annoy me. I have been twice brought to such extremity, that I could scarcely endure. On this account, I have long wished to pay you a visit; but, hitherto, the Lord has not permitted it. I can assure you, honoured Brethren, that I count not my life dear unto myself, and spare no pains on behalf of my Lord and this people. I have considered myself as their bondsman for Christ's sake.—But you cannot think what a race I have to do with. Were it possible that our Saviour would not have *all* men to be saved, I should certainly suppose *they* formed the exception: but it is not possible. Most of the adults say—'We feel that what we hear of Jesus is the truth, but we are not able to *believe* it.' They have now heard often of the Lamb of God, as taking away the sin of the world, and that his precious blood is the ransom for all our iniquities; but, though they listen, they are like reeds, shaken by the wind. The baptised are not much better, Joshua alone shewing more stability; so that I have not yet celebrated the Lord's supper with them; and, since the interdict laid upon me, must now wait for a licence. I have often admonished the parents to keep their children regularly to their school-hours, and to their other tasks, and to correct them for their misconduct; but I see little effect produced. The Lord think on me, and remember my tears and painful toil, for his name's sake; for in me there is no worthiness. If He but grant me his support, I am satisfied. I would rather die than bring disgrace on his name. Remember me, then, O happy flock! You are a camp for me, while I keep the field; your trumpets sound an inspiring strain in my ears. Hasten, at the Lord's command, to burst through the barrier which lies across the way to Africa. The Lord bless you out of his holy habitation! Peace be within your walls, and prosperity within your palaces."

"August 25th," proceeds his narrative, "I received permission to return to Europe, to my great relief; for my situation became more and more perplexing, the colonists having almost entirely corrupted the poor Hottentots by their bad example, and their calumnies against me. October 6th, I gave up my hut to Christian, till either I or my Brethren should come to claim it, and removed to the Company's post. On the 30th, I visited my Hottentots for the last time, and addressed to them a farewell discourse from Paul's words to the Ephesian Elders, during which many tears were shed.

"November 18th, I bid farewell to the station, where I had several times preached the Gospel, and proceeded to Cape-Town. The Council having readily granted me permission to return home, I took leave of the Governor, February 29th, 1744, and begged him not to suffer my little flock to be driven away from their present dwellings; which he very obligingly assured me he would not. He also gave me an honourable testimonial, in writing, to my unblamable conduct in the colony. Similar testimonials were drawn up for me by various respectable citizens, who knew and loved me. March 4th, I went on board the ship, which sailed the next day; and, June 22nd, I arrived in safety at Amsterdam. The number of Hottentots under my care, at the time of my departure, was 47."

Schmidt's own narrative here closes. He arrived at Marienborn, July 19th, and greatly enjoyed his residence in that congregation. As there was no intention of relinquishing the Mission at the Cape, Count Zinzendorf made an application to the East India Company, in the following year, through Schmidt, (who earnestly longed to return thither), requesting a passage for him and an assistant. The petition was, however, refused, and Schmidt returned in January, 1746, to Marienborn. Subsequently, a former servant of the Company, named Schiwäbler, who had accompanied Schmidt on his voyage back, and was a member of the congregation at Herrnhaag, offered himself to serve the deserted Hottentots. No obstacle being thrown in his way, he arrived amongst them in 1748, and continued his labours till his death. A friend of Schmidt reports, that, in 1757, Joshua and Christian were still living in the place, but that they died the following year; the rest were scattered, and the place lay desolate. Even 40 years after his departure, the blessed effects of his

labours had not entirely ceased. Amongst other testimonies to this effect, we may mention that of some Brethren who went out to the East Indies in the year 1782—"We found," they state, "several cheering traces of Br. George Schmidt's former residence at the Cape; an old Hottentot woman, in particular, whom he had taught to read, and who still peruses her Bible diligently, had much to say of him."

On the renewal of the Mission in the year 1792, the three Brethren sent out for this purpose, found part of the walls of Schmidt's first residence yet standing; the same was the case at Bavianskloof, (now Genadendal), where he subsequently dwelt. They also found several fruit-trees of his planting, particularly an almond and an apricot tree, and a gigantic pear-tree. This pear-tree continued to adorn the Mission Garden, at Genadendal, for many successive years, and to yield abundantly,—no inapt emblem of the spiritual fruit that has been gathered in on the same spot. Last year (1837) it was, however, found to be so much decayed, that it was cut down, and a sapling from its aged trunk planted in its place. They had likewise the pleasure to find his convert, Magdalena, (commonly called Helena), still alive, though bent down with extreme old age. She could not, indeed, at first, give any account of the instruction she had received from him; but when they recalled the main points to her recollection, and assured her that they were his brethren, and would be glad to lead her in the way of salvation, as he had done, she expressed great joy. She was almost blind, and could no longer make use of a Dutch Testament, which Schmidt had given her, and of which she was very choice. This Testament is now in the possession of Mr. Hallbeck, and bears evident marks of having been in constant use. From its pages the history of the Saviour's birth was read to the company of Hottentots who assembled around the newly arrived Missionaries on the Christmas day, in the year 1792, and to whom they first proclaimed the message of salvation. Magdalena stated, that she was the first Hottentot woman who had visited Schmidt, and that she had cooked for those who laboured in building his house. On his departure, the Hottentots had engaged themselves to the farmers; and the place, which in his time was very populous, was at last quite deserted.

In 1746, Schmidt was joined in holy matrimony at Herrnhaag, to Maria Mahowsky. Their marriage was blessed with two children, both of whom, however, preceded their father into eternity. He was first commissioned, with his wife, to labour among the converts in Silesia, on the Bohemian and Moravian frontiers. He then went to Niesky, where he was employed as an assistant in the ministry, and took special charge of the Bohemian part of the congregation. He next filled various offices at Herrnhut and Bertholsdorf; after which he undertook the domestic superintendance of the school at Uhyst, combined with the spiritual charge of the Wendish Society in that district. Thence he removed once more to Niesky, where he built himself a cottage, and was many years a valuable member of the congregation committee. He and his wife maintained themselves by the labour of their hands; and, amongst other services yielded to the congregation, he undertook the charge of the burial-ground, which soon after became his own resting-place.

In November, 1780, he became a widower. His strength declining, he was in part maintained by the contributions of his brethren and

sisters, and had besides numerous presents from other quarters. But, having been accustomed to a very spare and frugal mode of living from his youth up, which even the severest illnesses did not induce him materially to alter, he laid by what he did not absolutely need, expressing his intention to leave his house and property to the fund for the relief of the poor of the congregation.

August 1st, 1785, he complained, in the evening, of not feeling well; but went to the meeting, according to his regular practice. Next morning he was seen working in his garden; but, on re-entering his house, he must have had an apoplectic seizure, for, towards noon, he was found a corpse in his room. He was just then a member of what was called the company of intercessors, and his departure took place in the hour of prayer which had been allotted to him, and for the observance of which he had, in all probability, left the garden. We may, therefore, very reasonably suppose that the last sighs of this Apostle of the Hottentots were breathed forth for the spiritual welfare of a people that lay so near his heart. Thus did this faithful intercessor sow, for the last time, in tears, and richly has the blessing fallen on the now fertile field of the African Mission. Scarcely had he closed his eyes, when the prospect of renewing that Mission began to assume a more definite form, and a more favourable appearance, than it had ever done before. His brethren give the following testimony respecting him:—

"Our late Brother was a living picture of the primitive grace and simplicity, the spirit, life, and fire—the love and the power, which were so evident, and so attractive, in our first Brethren. A few days only before his end, he said to a friend—'I live indeed a truly happy life; but I must tell you, dear Brother, that, many a time, my heart feels as dry and empty as a potsherd. Then I beg and entreat my Saviour to grant me a new supply, and wait on him, like a dog at his master's table, till he gives me again some crumbs for my needy heart.' It was evident, however, that he lived in the closest and most confidential intercourse with his Saviour; his heart was full of his unspeakable love, and his mouth constantly overflowed with the subject so dear to him. This uniform fellowship of spirit with his unseen Friend was the most striking feature in his character. He delighted in the sacred volume; and his soul lived, from day to day, on the words of Christ. This was the attraction which led him to repair so diligently to the house of God. At home or abroad, resting or at work, he was constantly engaged with the Friend of his soul. His walk and conversation were exemplary, and proved him to be a true follower of Jesus. His fervent brotherly love was especially remarkable, and he seemed inspired with new life, when he could converse with his brethren on the things of Christ. The exhortation of the verse—

'Every one stir up his brother
To keep Jesus still in view,
Each encouraging the other,
Christ's example to pursue,'

was fully complied with, as far as he was concerned; and they, who enjoyed his intercourse, can testify what blessing and encouragement they derived from it.

"As age advanced, his bodily infirmities, especially the pain and weakness in his feet, the consequence of his long imprisonment at Schildberg, became more and more perceptible; but a believing look raised to the Man of sorrows lightened every burden, and he was uniformly cheerful, looking forward, with joyful anticipation, to the coming of his Lord. Thus, on the very day preceding his unexpected decease, he gave utterance to the most lively expressions of desire to depart, and to be with Christ. He was one of those servants who wait for the Lord, come when He may; and the Lord was pleased to translate him in stillness and solitude, to the perfect state, so that his spirit found itself removed at once from this dying life to the bosom of his Redeemer. He had attained to the age of nearly 76 years."

We wish we had space to add to the above narrative of George

Schmidt, the earliest Evangelist of the despised Hottentot race, some passages from the Diaries of those servants of God, who, after the lapse of a full century, have been permitted to enter into his labours. If the former exhibit to us "the patience and faith of the saints," the latter tell us of some of those triumphs which the servants of Christ are destined to achieve, "through the blood of the Lamb, and the word of their testimony." We will add only the following bare statement; that in the year 1836 there were baptized, at this mission, 38 children, and 32 adults; admitted to live on the place, 77 persons; received into the congregation 29, and the same number became communicants; 40 departed this life; 13 left the congregation, and 3 couple were married. At the close of 1836, the congregation numbered: Communicants, 629; baptized adults, 237; children, 391; new people and candidates for baptism, 200: total, 1457. Of these, 459 are married people; 53, widowers; 90, widows; 192, single men; 130, single women; 533, children.

ON ALLEGED SPONTANEOUS ANIMAL AND VEGETABLE PRODUCTION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN referring back to the curious facts mentioned in the review of Mr. Crosse's experiments in your Number for last January, pp. 58—64, I am reminded of some remarkable records of a similar character, collected by that judicious Christian philosopher Dr. Dwight. The account will be found in his "Travels" (Vol. ii. Letter x. of the Journey to Vergennes); but as that massy and (as a whole) unreadable work is not likely to be in the hands of many of your readers, I think the passage will be well worth reprinting; more especially as Mr. Crosse's "maggots" have revived the absurd and long-exploded doctrine of spontaneous animal and vegetable production; and we are told, as gravely as atheistically, that the time may come when the chemist in his laboratory will manufacture new and unknown forms of living existence; that we shall hatch chickens without eggs; and that as "organization is life," we have but to hit upon some hitherto undiscovered application of electro-magnetism, or other subtile agents, and forthwith, as by the wand of an enchanter, we shall fabricate full-grown whales or elephants, as easily as Mr. Crosse does mites. I do not know that Mr. Crosse himself derives from his experiments any improper conclusions; or that he attempts to come to any conclusion at all upon the very remarkable circumstances which he has brought to light: but there are those who do not scruple to build upon them the most absurd and atheistical hypotheses, too aptly illustrating the declaration of Holy Writ respecting all irreligious philosophists of every age, that "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Need we go further for proof of this, than to the recent statements of certain infidel experimentalists in Gower Street, upon animal magnetism? The following are Dr. Dwight's facts:

"The lands which have here been once cultivated (he is speaking of Addison in Vermont), and again permitted to lie waste for several years, yield a rich and fine growth of hickory. Of this wood there is not, I believe, a single tree in any original forest within fifty miles from this spot. The native growth is here white pine; of which I did not see a single stem amid a whole grove of hickory. Simi-

lar specimens of an entire change in the forest vegetation are common in many, perhaps in all, parts of New England, where the land has been cultivated, and again covered with wood. *This change is commonly attributed by unthinking, as it has often been by thinking, men to equivocal generation, the material elements being supposed to possess a chemical power of originating and perfecting vegetation without the aid of seeds.* To support the supposition, however, philosophy, although she has frequently adopted it, *has never been able to find a single fact or to allege a particle of positive evidence.* The opinion obviously contradicts all known analogy, and is sustained only by that broken reed, inexplicableness.

"The seeds of vegetables, when lodged beneath that thin stratum of earth within which they can germinate [that is, beyond the reach of atmospheric influence], have no apparent tendency to decay, but continue to possess all their vegetative power through an indefinite number of centuries. When the existing forest is cut down, and its seeds are destroyed by cultivation, those which were shed by a more ancient growth, being thrown up by the plough within the limits of this stratum, spring in their turn, and cover the surface with trees of a new kind. The following facts will throw some light on this subject. A field, about five miles from Northampton, on an eminence called Rail Hill, was cultivated about a century ago. The native growth here, and in all the surrounding region, was wholly oak, chesnut, &c. As the field belonged to my grandfather, I had the best opportunity of learning its history. It contained about five acres, in the form of an irregular parallelogram. As the savages rendered the cultivation dangerous, it was given up. On this ground there sprang up a grove of white pines, covering the field, and retaining its figure exactly. So far as I remember, there was not in it a single oak or chestnut tree. Pines were as thick as they could conveniently grow; and when I first saw them, about the year 1760, had attained a considerable size. When I last saw them, more than twenty years afterwards, they were large trees; yet there was not a single pine whose seeds were, or probably had for ages been, sufficiently near to have been planted on the spot. The facts, that these white pines covered this field exactly, so as to preserve both its extent and figure, and that there were none in the neighbourhood, are decisive proofs that cultivation brought up the seeds of a former forest within the limits of vegetation, and gave them an opportunity to germinate. The regularity and limits of the process are entirely inconsistent with the doctrine of equivocal generation.

"A respectable farmer in Guildford informed me, some years since, that, thirty years before the event to which I principally refer in this paragraph, took place, his father while reaping a field of wheat, found a quantity of chess, which he directed his labourers to reap also, and bind in bundles, to be carried home for fodder. On the day when the wheat was carried home, it was inconvenient to carry the chess; it was, therefore, thrown together upon a bawk [*balk*, the margin of a field, where the plough is balked, and obliged to turn: it is not in Johnson] or head-land. The following night it was drenched with rain, and was finally left to rot upon the place. Thirty years after this fact, the field having come, by his father's death, into the possession of my informant, it became necessary to make a new fence between that and another bordering upon it; but as a considerable number of bushes had grown up upon the head-lands on both sides, he concluded to remove the fence, and break up these head-lands. The ground was accordingly cleared and ploughed, and on the spot where the chess had been thrown, there sprang up a new crop of chess, as evenly spread as if it had been sown by a skilful hand.

"The Hon. Judge Reeve, of Litchfield, told me, some years ago, that a farmer of his acquaintance having sown turnips, and suffered some of them to remain on a field, they produced seed the following year, which was scattered on the ground. For twenty-five afterwards—that is, to the time when the fact was mentioned to me—whenever this field was ploughed, turnips in considerable numbers sprang up in this spot.

"Mr. Parker, an English gentleman from Yorkshire, who came, some years since, to the United States, as the agent from the merchants of England to the government of this country, informed me that a tract of marshy ground, on the eastern coast of England, had, some years before, been purchased by several gentlemen, and drained. On the earth, which was thrown out of the ditches cut through it, there sprang a great quantity of white mustard. As this plant had not been known to grow any where in the vicinity, within the remembrance of any living man, its appearance excited much curiosity. After many schemes to account for it had been proposed, and rejected, it was found, that, two hun-

dred years before, white mustard had been extensively cultivated on the same spot by a colony of Dutch settlers.

"I could easily add other instances to these, a number of which have fallen under my own observation, but it must be unnecessary. If seeds will continue possessed of vegetative life for twenty years, they may, unquestionably, continue possessed of it two hundred, two thousand, or twenty thousand. There can, therefore, be no difficulty in assigning the cause of any phenomenon like that which gave birth to this discussion.

"I will conclude these observations by mentioning a remarkable fact, communicated to me by the Hon. Judge Chipman, of Vermont. The gentleman told me, while I was at Rutland on this journey, that, when he resided at Kingston, in the county of Addison, there customarily sprang up, in the cultivated fields on his estate, an immense multitude of cherry-trees, of a peculiar species. The original forest was here composed of beech, maple, hemlock, &c., and appeared as ancient as any American forest whatever! It was perfectly destitute of those cherry trees. As he was walking in a field newly broken up, and recently ploughed, he observed the infant stems of these cherry trees sprung up in very great numbers. His workmen, who believed in the doctrine of equivocal generation, triumphantly asked him, whence he supposed these trees to proceed. Without answering the question, he forced his hand a little distance into the earth, and drew up a handful of cherry stones."

It may be questioned whether there is anything more wonderful in Mr. Crosse's facts than in some of these. Assuredly the eggs of the *acari* might lie in a dormant state, and continue so for an indefinite period, till roused into activity by the stimulus given to them by long-continued voltaic or other appropriate action; without any necessity for supposing that such eggs never existed, or were produced by chemical action. To violate all known fact and analogy at sight of one single unexplained occurrence, is to subvert the whole Baconian system of philosophy, and to go back to the "occult causes" of the most ignorant and barbarous ages.

A BACONIAN.

INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ECCLESIASTICAL OPINIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIANS IN IRELAND.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Amidst the classification of English and Irish parties, religious and political, in reference to national churches, I do not remember to have seen any distinct statement respecting the views of a body of persons by no means unimportant for talents, piety, or numbers—the Presbyterians of Ireland. The Episcopalians of Great Britain and Ireland are of course favourable to the support of a national Protestant church in Ireland; and they are supported by the great body of the Wesleyan Methodists, and by the Presbyterians in Scotland. The Dissenters of all kinds are adverse, upon general principles, to that measure; and none more so than those who call themselves Presbyterians, but who have no particular right to that appellation (I am speaking of England), being in fact, for the most part, Arian or Socinian Independents, who have adhered to the name of Presbyterians only for the sake of enjoying the Lady Hewley and other old orthodox endowments. But the Presbyterians in Ireland, if we may judge by the speeches of their admirable Dr. Cooke, and their general course of policy, are closely leagued with their episcopal brethren in supporting the Protestant Established Church of Ireland; being willing to waive their peculiarities as Presbyterians, for the sake of our common ob-

ject as Christians and Protestants. Now if this be the case, as I trust it is, it ought to be publicly announced; for these are not times in which we can afford to have either cold friends or concealed enemies. That it was not the case some years since, is historically known; I will quote, in proof, only a short passage from a pamphlet published in 1787, by the Bishop of Cloyne (Dr. Woodward, the father of Mr. Woodward, whose excellent discourses you lately reviewed), entitled, "The Precarious Situation of the Church of Ireland, and the consequent Danger to the Public; with some Reflections on the Impracticability of a proper Commutation of Tithes." Having appealed to "the Protestant proprietors of land," as knowing them well aware that "the security of their title depends very much, if not entirely, on the Protestant ascendancy; and that the preservation of that ascendancy depends entirely on an indissoluble connexion between the sister kingdoms" (this was twenty-three years before the Union); the Bishop proceeds to consider what part the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland would take in any contests which might arise respecting the Established Church; upon which topic he says:

"Most of the leading Presbyterians in this kingdom, indeed all whose opinions the author has been able to collect, differ essentially from their brethren of Geneva, Switzerland, Holland, Germany, and Scotland, as they reject the idea of any national church. If the church of Scotland, to which they have an hereditary attachment, and to the forms of which they adhere, were established in this kingdom, they would still dissent. They are Independents in a civil view, though they are Presbyterians as to ecclesiastical discipline. Their principles do not, like those of the Roman Catholics, tend to set up, but merely to pull down, an ecclesiastical establishment. From these premises the conclusion is manifest, and in such times the plain truth must be spoken, *and it is for the interest of the Protestant Dissenters that the truth should be proclaimed;* that of the three persuasions, the members of the Established Church alone can be cordial friends to *the entire* constitution of this realm with perfect consistency of principle."

The Bishop afterwards points out why it was for the interest of the Protestant Dissenter himself that this truth should be proclaimed. He says:

"Our Protestant brethren in particular will do well to consider, *before it be too late*, what will be the effect of the ultimate superiority of Popery on their future situation. The short-sighted farmer in Ulster may perhaps be seduced by the present prospect of lowering his tithes; of which he does not discern the effect. The short-sighted politician, who yet may see far enough to discern the *immediate* effect, may be gratified by the prospect of realizing his favourite speculation, that of overturning an ecclesiastical establishment. But as soon as that shall have been accomplished, the fairy vision will have vanished. For will this kingdom continue long without *any* national church? It is a situation too wild and unexampled to be supposed. Will it adopt the church of Calvin? Let the Presbyterians review either numbers or property, and then judge whether that be a probable event. They can have nothing then before them but an option of the ascendancy of either the church of Ireland or the church of Rome. Of the former they have had a long trial; and under it have always experienced freedom of religion, and at present enjoy every civil privilege, in common with the members of the Established Church. Their situation cannot be improved. How much it may be changed for the worse under the church of Rome it behoves them to consider with attention and without delay."

The changes which have taken place in the ecclesiastical and political condition of Ireland, since the period when Bishop Woodward was writing, only render his remarks the more applicable and forcible. The time has arrived when the question must be decided whether the Established Church of Ireland shall be upheld, against avowed enemies and false or timid friends; and to no class of persons is its

maintenance more important than to the Presbyterians, who would be the first to be crushed under the weight of the blows of the giant Maul of Popery; whose maxim never was to live and let live, but to exterminate whatever he cannot reduce to obedience. Do the Presbyterians of Ireland fully discern the perils of their position, should Popery gain the ascendant, and expel Protestantism as a national church; and are they prepared to act, heart and hand, with their Episcopalian brethren, in defence of the common faith and the common liberty? RUSTICUS.

ON THE NATURE AND EFFECTS OF BAPTISM.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

You have frequently warned your readers (see, inter alia, p. 90, &c. of your Number for last February), but the warning requires to be reiterated, of the danger, while opposing certain erroneous opinions now promulgated on baptismal regeneration, of running into the opposite extreme, and lowering baptism to a mere formal rite, an admission into the outward church, and expecting no blessing in answer to the prayers (if it be) of faith, offered up at baptism by the parents or sponsors, the ministers or the congregation. I have been disposed to take the following view of the subject:—

I. Baptism and regeneration by the Holy Spirit are not always and necessarily connected: 1. The thief on the cross was regenerated without baptism; 2. Simon Magus was baptised without being regenerated; 3. Cornelius and his friends were regenerated first, and then baptised.

II. In the baptism of adults, regeneration by the Spirit *ought* to precede baptism. Faith (as in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch) and repentance are pre-requisites to baptism. Faith is the gift of the Holy Spirit, and so is repentance. No one can call Jesus Lord, but by the Spirit. The adult who reeceives baptism rightly, is not *thereby* born again of the Spirit; but is engrafted into the visible, as he was already a member of the invisible, church; and at the same time "faith is *confirmed* and grace *increased* by virtue of prayer unto God."

III. If an adult be baptised without faith and repentance, he is not thereby regenerated. The rite has no "wholesome effect or operation." He may be grafted into the visible, but he is not thereby made a member of the spiritual church; he *may* afterwards believe and repent; he *may* afterwards be regenerated by the Spirit; and this blessing, notwithstanding *his* sinful receiving of the rite, *may* be vouchsafed in answer to prayer then offered up for him by others: and, if he be thus born again of the Spirit, he need not be re-baptised—his one baptism by water followed, though not accompanied, by baptism of the Spirit, suffices as his admission into the visible, while by spiritual regeneration he is engrafted into the invisible, church.

IV. If an unbaptised adult, professing faith in Christ, refuse to obey his command in respect of baptism, he has reason to doubt the sincerity of his faith, unless he honestly (though erroneously) suppose the command not applicable to the present day.

V. In the case of infants, faith and repentance cannot precede baptism. In this case then is baptism merely an admission into the

outward church. May it not be accompanied with, or preceded by, spiritual regeneration, not necessarily, but in answer to the prayer of faith? 1. An infant is capable of spiritual regeneration: the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." 2. Why then may we not hope for this blessing in answer to the prayers of the sponsors, or parents, or minister, offered up in baptism, *if offered in faith?* 3. If not so offered, no *spiritual* blessing can be expected, though the infant may be ingrafted into the visible church, and may *afterwards* obtain spiritual regeneration.

If these views are correct, they go far towards removing the difficulty which attends some expressions in our Baptismal service and in the Catechism; and they furnish a strong ground for those who bring an infant to baptism, to offer up the prayers in faith; while no such doubts need arise in the mind of any individual, whether baptised in infancy or in more mature years, as are suggested by the Bishop of Ripon's chaplain. Nor would any one have ground to think himself regenerated, unless he brought forth the fruits of the Spirit. Φιλος.

ON TRANSLATING BAPTISM BY IMMERSION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Upon reading the letter by the Rev. J. Hinton to Lord Bexley, stitched up among the bills under the cover of your September Number, one of my daughters asked me whether, in the required alterations by the Baptists of the "practice of the English version," they would change the word baptize, in every case, for immerse; as, for instance, Matt. iii. 11, "he shall *immerse* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" and so in verses 13, 14. Again, Mark i. 8, "he shall *immerse* you with the Holy Ghost." So also in Matt. iii. 1, "John the *Immerser*;" with many other texts.

I really could not answer the question; but by inserting this letter in one of your Numbers, I may perhaps attain the desired information. Of course there is no doubt among the members of the Church of England as to immersion being a proper mode of performing the solemnity; the only questions are, whether the Greek word refers to that mode always and exclusively, and whether the sacrament is invalid without it; neither of which can be conceded.

YOUR CONSTANT READER.

PROPOSED RAIL-ROAD SURVEY OF SPONTANEOUS VEGETABLE PRODUCTION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Since sending for insertion in your pages the very curious facts collected by Dr. Dwight, relative to supposed spontaneous production [the paper is inserted in our December Number, p. 804], it has struck me as highly desirable that a survey should be made along the line of the various rail-roads, of the botanical specimens which have spontaneously grown up on the new ground where there are cuttings

—by "spontaneously," I mean without being intentionally sown by the hands of man; not of course in the sense of equivocal production. The depth, the nature of the stratum, the weeds (or whatever the productions may be), the character of the adjacent undisturbed soil, its indigenous growth, its cultivated products, and any other characteristic phenomena, should be noticed. The facts, when collated, might be of great utility to the botanist, the geologist, the natural historian, the chemist, the agriculturalist, and, not remotely, even to the theologian. I refer your readers to Dr. Dwight's remarks, or the facts stated in your review of Mr. Crosse's experiments (January 1838, p. 58), to shew the important bearings of the question; and never may so favourable an opportunity occur for collecting a large body of facts, as in the cuttings and embankments of rail-roads.

It is probable that some of your readers are connected with some scientific institution which would prosecute the inquiry. A practical botanist could not have a greater treat than such an excursion; and there are many intelligent persons along the line of road, who would cheerfully communicate such facts as may come locally under their observation.

A BACONIAN.

ON THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD IN DAILY LIFE; WITH ILLUSTRATIONS FROM FACTS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I PERUSED with much pleasure your judicious critique on "the Record of Providence," in your Number for March, 1836; and also the paper of your correspondent, "An Old Sunday School Teacher," in your Number for the following month; and I fully agreed with both, in condemning many of those improbable (not to say incredible) anecdotes, of which fair specimens were given in both the above papers, and the moral of which is so frequently at variance with that of the numerous instances of Divine Providence recorded in Scripture. But while we must question, or even condemn, the expediency of thus heating the imagination on so important a subject, by the recital of events so wide of the common path of life, we must openly avow our equal condemnation of the opposite error, so very common in the world, of regarding the inscrutable ways of Providence as the mere effects of a blind *chance;* and reject the supposition of thousands around us, that events, because they appear trivial *in our eyes,* are unworthy of being considered as under the guidance of a merciful and provident God. There are many persons who contemplate, with reverence and deep feeling, such *great* events as are, in common language, termed providential, who yet are inclined to deny to the every-day occurrences of life an equal evidence of watchful care and guidance. This common error arises from a mere want of reflection; for it requires but a slight study of the ways of Providence, as daily exhibited around us, to be fully convinced that a line cannot be drawn between the more important and the more trivial events of life. It has, in all ages, been remarked

"What great events from trifling causes spring;"

but these causes are not in general remarked, until the attention is

forcibly attracted to them by the more striking results to which they are in fact but steps. A person, for instance, goes out to take a walk, quite indifferent as to the particular direction to which he may bend his steps. After perhaps changing his mind more than once, he advances without any fixed design on his own part; but before he returns home, he has the gratification of having been the means of saving the life of a fellow creature, who had no other visible *chance* of preservation. In such a case as this, every event, however trifling, which brought this person to the spot at the very moment when his presence was required, would by one party be termed providential; while, to the other, they must have appeared as they occurred, *merely accidental;* and would only be regarded in a higher light, from the important result to which they eventually led. Thus we cannot fail to perceive how the minds of numbers must be misled by the constant use of the terms *accident, luck, fortune,* and the like, with which our language is so abundantly interlarded; and it is but too evident, that with the terms *accident* and *fortune,* which we have acquired from the Romans,* we habitually attach to them the very same ideas as they did, although so utterly unworthy of those who have the Gospel for their rule and guidance. We are there distinctly told, (what events around us are so well calculated to impress upon us) that a hair of the head cannot be injured, nor even a sparrow fall to the ground, without the knowledge and consent of our Heavenly Father; nor can we go far in Scripture history, without abundant proofs in illustration of this great truth. The whole history of Joseph, for example, is one continued series of facts, which, *while they were in progress,* must have been regarded, by the actors, as *trivial;* and yet we now know that each event was a link in one of the most remarkable chains to be found in the whole range of history, whether sacred or profane. In like manner, the early history of Moses; his concealment by his mother; his discovery, when at length exposed, by the apparent *chance* of one of the only persons passing that way who could have dared to interfere in his behalf: these exhibit instances of God's dealings with men too striking to escape remark; and yet, *at the time,* few would have attributed them, trifling as they seemed, to any thing higher than "the merest chance." I was led to these reflections by the perusal of your critique above-mentioned, and drew up some remarks and illustrations upon the subject; but fearing that my paper might be too long for insertion, I laid it aside, and it did not meet my eye again, till a few days ago. On re-perusal, it has occurred to me that the facts which it contains may be usefully employed, and I therefore send the recital of them to your excellent Observer.

The work which you were reviewing, is one of a class, the intention of which is good, although their tendency may prove injurious, from their adopting many relations which could but ill bear a strict scrutiny. It is, however, as unnecessary as it is injudicious, to resort to doubtful or improbable anecdotes, in illustration of the dealings of Providence; for no one, observant of such things, can be much at a loss, after some years of experience, for a great variety of facts, which have either come within his own observation, or which could be attested by most respectable witnesses. I could myself adduce many

* "Profectò *fortuna* in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas, ex *lubidine*, magis quàm ex *vero*, celebrat obscuratque."—*Sallust. Catil.* 8.

remarkable instances of this great truth, as having come within my own observation; but I shall confine myself to the recital of two or three only, which have occurred within my own family circle. If the perusal of the following statements has the beneficial effect upon any of your readers, which the facts themselves were so well calculated to produce upon those who witnessed them, my present object will be fully attained.

The first event which I shall mention, occurred in the family of a very near relative of mine, still living, who, after having held, for some time, a distinguished military command on a foreign station, was on his voyage home, with his lady and several children, in a troop ship. The weather was fine, and the vessel under easy sail, when two fine boys, his sons, of about 6 and 7 years of age, were sent to amuse themselves on deck, under the care of a steady seaman. Amongst other amusements, they prevailed on their attendant to allow them to play with the log-line, by dragging it in the water, and, as they termed it, fishing. This continued to amuse them some time, and the attention of the sailor had probably been called away from his young charges, when suddenly he was aroused by an exclamation from the younger boy, that he had *caught a fish!* and on seizing the line, which was rapidly slipping through the child's hands, he found that something was indeed hanging to it, which, as he knew it could not be a fish, excited his alarm, and the word was soon heard of "a man overboard!" Not a moment was lost in lowering a boat, and in hastening to the rescue of the "unfortunate" sufferer. But who can express the astonishment of all on board, when the eldest of the two boys was picked up, nearly exhausted, and with the log-line so firmly grasped in his hand, that it was not removed without considerable force! The means of recovery were promptly used, and the child was restored to the arms of his mother, before she was made aware of the serious risk from which he had just been rescued.

It afterwards appeared, from his own account, that he had, unperceived by the seaman, quitted that part of the ship where his younger brother was still amusing himself with the log-line; and that, on looking over the bows of the ship, he had lost his balance, and fallen into the sea. The ship, being under easy sail, passed him; and he could give no further account of his sensations, nor of the means by which he caught hold of the floating cord, which, happily for him, *chanced* still to be the object of his little brother's pastime on deck. It is certain, that in his natural efforts to save his life he would have instinctively grasped at any straw which might happen to be within his reach; and therefore, it may be urged, that the seizing the cord ought only to be considered as an instinctive effort, and such as even a drowning dog might almost be supposed capable of exhibiting. But who can fail to perceive, in this instance, the goodness and providence of God? Had the boy *chanced* to fall overboard at any other time; had he *chanced* to fall on the opposite side of the bowsprit; had the sea been stormy, or the ship gliding rapidly through the water; had his brother been, as *he* was, tired of his play; or had the line, so often out of the water, not *chanced* to be *in* the water at that exact moment; in short, when his hand was guided to it, had he not grasped it with a convulsive force, much more than his natural: had any one of these links been wanting in the chain, he never would have been missed, until far beyond the reach of human rescue. In the

common language of the world, this would be described as a most *fortunate* escape, and by the merest accident; but in thus speaking of it, the idea of a Providential interference seldom occurs to the mind. It may even be objected by some, that unless some great ulterior object was to be attained, the circumstances were too trifling to be worthy of being deemed providential. It may be demanded, What was the eventual history of the individual? and was he ever called forth into such prominent view as to warrant the supposition of such providential interference in his favour? Events have subsequently shewn, that if the providential character of this event depended on such evidence alone, the idea must at once be abandoned. Both the interesting objects of this narrative were permitted to grow up to manhood, but have now been called into another world, in the very bloom of manly beauty. The circumstances above related were, however, too remarkable ever to be forgotten, either by themselves, or by numbers of others who witnessed them; and it is a sufficient vindication of the Divine *intention*, in so visible an interposition, that the minds of many might be roused from that indifference into which continued prosperity too often lulls us. It is to be hoped that the warning was not *then* thrown away; nor will it even *now* have been in vain, if it excite the attention of any one of your readers to circumstances not less providential which are daily occurring around him.

The following event, which occurred in the presence of several members of the same family some years ago, is of a more melancholy nature, but is not less striking and instructive when viewed in a proper light. It is one of the thousands of instances which daily occur in the world, in which individuals insensibly rush into or escape out of situations fraught with danger; and is well calculated as a warning to us to be ever watchful and in readiness, not knowing the day or the hour when the last awful summons may be issued to call us from this world.

The mail coach from Dublin to Belfast had, on the occasion in question, not proceeded far on its journey, when a respectable-looking man ran up, and with the greatest earnestness entreated to be taken up. It was quite full, both inside and out, and he was therefore told that there was no room. His business, however, appeared most urgent, and he ran for some distance by the side of the coach, entreating to be placed any where outside. His great anxiety at length attracted the attention of my friends, who occupied the inside; and by their request, (perhaps even by the promise of a bribe,) a strict regulation was, for once, broken through in his favour, and he obtained the wished-for seat on the roof of the coach. It proved a "fatal" seat to him: for within a very short distance, one of the axles of the carriage snapped; the coach fell over on the side opposite to that on which he had been placed; he alighted upon his head, and never spoke more! He proved to be a commercial traveller for a mercantile house, and had the charge of a considerable sum of money, which rendered a conveyance by the mail highly desirable in a country at that time, as now, by no means safe. He was the only person killed; nor indeed was there any one else materially injured on the occasion. Thus, with all the circumstances opposed to his obtaining the seat which proved "fatal" to him, the minds of others were bent, as it were, out of the common course, and undoubtedly with the express intention of fulfilling the providential decree by which this man was to meet his end. Had he been refused a seat, and had another person lost his life while in the only

place he could have occupied, if taken up, this man would undoubtedly have spoken of his escape as a most *providential* one. [While I am sending off these remarks, the newspapers are giving an account of what they justly call the "providential escape" of a passenger who was on board a steam vessel, the only one who was landed, so far as is at present known, from the too probable wreck of that vessel.] But we must not confine the term "providential" to events alone in which lives are *spared;* every minute circumstance, however trifling, by which this person was conducted to the period of his appointed time, may properly be termed providential; and although we ought not to suffer our minds to be kept in a constant state of indecision and alarm, lest we should be inadvertently accelerating our own destruction, yet we are here taught the necessity of a calm and constant state of preparation, and a full submission to that Almighty, yet just and merciful Power, in whose hands are "the issues of life and death."

This great precept, to which our attention is so constantly drawn, both in Scripture and in the daily occurrences of life, has been in a more especial manner impressed upon the minds of myself and my whole family, by a late truly providential deliverance from great danger, with a short sketch of which I shall conclude this paper. The house which I lately occupied being one of several which were lower than others in the same range, the chimneys had been recently raised to an imprudent height, in order to obviate occasional inconvenience from smoke. It had frequently been remarked, that they were too high for a situation rather exposed to winds; but as the builder and the proprietor of the house considered them quite secure, my family occupied it for some time without any apprehension. At length, during a severe gale from the South West, we were all aroused from sleep at six o'clock in a winter morning, while yet dark, by a heavy shock, which affected the whole house; and it instantly occurred to me that one of these chimneys had fallen. On proceeding to the upper part of the house, however, and on examination, both in the front and in the rear, outside, I found that our house had not suffered; and as I heard no noise in the neighbouring house, after the indistinct screams which were uttered at the moment, I concluded that nothing serious had occurred, and that we had been alarmed only by the fall of a common chimney cover. Under this impression, we all again retired to bed; and, on rising at half-past seven, I found the servants employed as usual at their in-doors occupation, without any one having had the curiosity even to inquire respecting the cause of our early disturbance.

On quitting my dressing-room at eight o'clock, I was proceeding as usual to my study, when it occurred to me to step out to the front of the house, to see what had fallen. This I did, from what one would call, in common speech, *mere curiosity,* and yet on that one act hung the life of one or more of my family! It was then that I found, to my horror, that the lofty chimney of the next house to my own had fallen prostrate, covering the entire width of the house; and that the two front rooms, which corresponded exactly with those of my children in my own house, had been completely destroyed. I was not personally acquainted with the family who occupied it; but I afterwards learnt, that a lady who slept in one of these rooms (happily in that *next* to the foundation of the chimney, where the force of the falling mass was least,) had been saved by the "mere chance" of

two beams crossing each other in their fall, from under which she had to creep. The other room was a small dressing-room, which was "fortunately" unoccupied at the moment: it sustained the full force of the higher part of the mass, and was entirely demolished. The screams which I had heard proceeded from the servant's attic, which happily was in the back part of the house, and remained uninjured.

I now saw the full extent of the danger from which we had been spared; for as our chimney was of equal height, and as both the corresponding rooms were occupied, nothing could have saved those who would have been thus buried, but some such *providential* interference as had been mercifully extended to the lady above mentioned. But I felt that the danger which had so long hung over us, whilé we securely slept, was even yet impending. It still blew as hard as ever, and all my family were still unconscious of what had occurred so near them, or of what might still at any moment occur to themselves. Not an instant was to be lost. I rushed up stairs, and desired the nurse to get my two younger children dressed, and take them down into the lower part of the house with as little delay as possible. I then went into my eldest son's room to give him the same warning; he was quietly reading in bed, intending not to rise till about half-past eight. Having taken these necessary precautions, I immediately returned to the front of the house, outside, to take a further view of the damage done to the next house; and while I was in the act of explaining the risk my own family had run, to a gentleman who chanced to come up at the moment, I perceived the great mass of brick-work in our own house begin to totter, and after a moment's pause, the whole fell prostrate, with an awful crash, upon the roof of my house, and involved in instant ruin the very rooms in which I had left three of my children *not five minutes before!* I shall not attempt to describe my feelings at such a moment; but shall leave to parents to conceive, what it would be difficult adequately to express. But something was to be done; the extent of the calamity was to be ascertained; and help, if not too late, was to be afforded. I again rushed to the upper part of the house, and was there happily relieved from a part of my anxiety, by finding that on my hint the nurse had promptly removed the two younger children from the room which they had occupied *during the whole of a stormy night,* but which was a scene of ruin *within two minutes after they left it!* As for my eldest son, a young man of near seventeen, there appeared to be no reasonable hope. His small bed-room was completely unroofed, and the light of heaven clearly seen over his door. That door, however, for some time resisted all our attempts to burst i open; the room within being now more than half filled with the ruins. I called aloud, but there was no reply. Our utmost exertions could only force open a few inches of the upper and more unincumbered part of the door, through which I saw, on the spot where a few minutes before the bed had stood, a mass of bricks and rubbish, without one vestige of the bed being visible. On the top of the ruin sat, trembling, a favourite little spaniel—but how preserved we could not then conceive. I had now given him up as lost; and with the assistance of some workmen who had assembled, we were proceeding to break down the door, when to our astonishment and delight, we heard my son's voice, as from the tomb. He called to us not to be alarmed; that he was safe, but that he could not move till the door was broken.

down. This was soon done, and we then saw him standing at the opposite extremity of the room in a stooping posture (he is very tall), on his dressing table, and in the small recess of his window, the upper lintel of which had, by "the merest chance," proved his shield. After the first burst of joy and thankfulness, and when he had crawled over the ruins, half dressed, and covered with soot and dust, we learned that he had risen, with more than his usual alacrity, when I called him, and was in the act of hurrying on his clothes, not far from the window, when he heard above him an undefined cracking; and hearing, at the same instant, exclamations below, in front of the house, he rushed to the window to see what was the matter; and on jumping on the table, with the intention of hanging out till relieved, the tremendous crash instantly followed, and his room was filled with ruins and a cloud of dust.

Thus was my son preserved under circumstances so remarkable, that it is in vain to speak of them as merely "accidental." On a recapitulation of the whole of them, we at once perceive how great were the *odds* (to use a common phrase) against his escaping without loss of either life or limb. The storm had raged during the whole night, with equal if not greater violence than at the moment of the fall. During many hours he, and all of us, reposed in peaceful security, quite unconscious of the tottering mass. The warning shock of two hours before, was not more than sufficient to startle us. We all again retired to rest: but a lesson was to be given, and unmerited mercy was to be extended. Thoughtless mortals were to be aroused to reflection; and human means were to be called in to effect a Provident design. Had I been a few minutes later than I was in rising; or a few minutes longer in dressing; had I followed my usual habit, and retired at once to my study; on going out, had the risk appeared to me less imminent than it did; had my son delayed his rising, as he usually did; had he, on the first alarm, rushed to the door, instead of to the window, which would have been a much more natural mode of escape; and, finally, had I not been below, and uttered the exclamations of terror which attracted my son's attention, and drew him to the window, (of which exclamation I have, to this moment, no recollection); in short, had any one of these numerous links in the chain been wanting, *he*, at least, must inevitably have been overwhelmed where he lay, and with so heavy a mass of ruin, that no reasonable hope of life could have been entertained. Besides a depth of several feet of heavy rubbish, which overwhelmed the entire bed, a massive earthen chimney-can, of great weight was found beneath it; and such was the force and weight of the whole, that the feet of the bed were forced through the floor, and appeared in the drawing-room below. The life of the poor little dog was saved in a manner not less remarkable. On the first alarm he took refuge, as usual, under the bed; and as my son afterwards saw him crawl from under that part of it at the head, nearest the wall, I was induced to examine whether there was any hollow there. I found that the cross part of the bed frame had there resisted the shock *at one end*, leaving a hollow not larger than the dog would occupy; and thus he must have been crushed to death had he taken refuge under any other part of the bed at the moment of his fright.

In the events of that morning, then, several lives had been in danger, yet no one suffered the smallest personal injury. It is to be hoped, that the beneficial effects of so remarkable an instance of

Divine mercy, will not prove fruitless. Like other events of the kind, it seemed to arouse the feelings of numbers, who spoke of it with that degree of reverence due to the inscrutable ways of the Almighty; and though such impressions are but too frequently blunted (even in those who have been the most favoured objects of Divine mercy) by the renewed cares and occupations of the world, yet we trust that some may have been led to view, for the remainder of their lives, the seemingly *trivial* events of their daily walk, as of far deeper importance than they once did; and may thus become more watchful against the temptations which most easily beset them, not knowing what a day or an hour may bring forth. They will learn from such events that "afflictions come not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground," (Job v. 6), but that to God's providence alone must we attribute the events which occur to us, whether they be in the form of pains or of pleasures; and that if "we receive good at the hand of God," we are surely bound in all duty and submission to receive also "the evil." (Job ii. 10.)

It is in the hope of still further inculcating the lessons to be drawn from such events, that I have thus been induced to trespass, at I fear too great a length, on your attention, and to offer these facts to the consideration of your readers. I shall only further add an expression of my sincere wish that all to whom such mercies are extended may experience and cherish as deep a feeling of gratitude to the Great Disposer of all human events, as myself and my family must ever continue to do.

By way of postscript, I subjoin the following additional instance of a providential escape from death, which has been mentioned to me by a friend, as having occurred in London. Soon after the gale in which we ourselves had so mercifully escaped, a very lofty chimney of a manufactory fell at Rotherhithe, by which several houses were destroyed, and one or more lives were lost. In this case, a woman who had long been confined to her bed from illness, in one of the neighbouring houses, was saved by *mistaking the hour* at which she had lately been accustomed to rise. This was twelve o'clock; but on that morning she looked at her watch, and *thinking it twelve, she rose at eleven.* Before twelve o'clock the chimney fell, and the room and bed in which she would have been lying, but for this mistake, were completely destroyed in the ruins.

I may also take this opportunity of recalling the attention of all who love to contemplate such instances of mercy, to the miraculous preservation of the crew and passengers of the Kent, East Indiaman, which was burnt on the first of March 1825 in the Bay of Biscay, and of which so interesting an account was published by one of the passengers, Major M'Gregor. This dreadful event was accompanied with circumstances altogether so remarkable, that they form, from first to last, a series of the most obvious instances of Divine interference, which can perhaps any where be found.

A LAYMAN.

*** As we have so often remarked that incidents brought forward to illustrate the special Providence of God should be well authenticated, we add that our Correspondent is a gentleman of consideration in society, and of unimpeachable veracity, who has devoted much time, at considerable labour and expense, to making researches in this and other lands, for the purpose of shewing the accordance of the phœnomena of nature with the disclosures of Divine revelation.

BANEFUL EFFECTS OF THE ROMANIST CONFESSIONAL.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I WAS glad to observe, in your Number for November, a paper calling the attention of your readers to the baneful effects of the confessional in the Church of Rome. The writer of that paper will, I am sure, pardon me for pointing out an expression which appears to me calculated to convey a very erroneous impression respecting the celebrated work known as "The Theology of Peter Dens." The expression I allude to, occurs in the second line from the bottom of p. 679, where, in speaking of the conduct of Talleyrand, the writer uses these words: "and even if he went to the extremity of the *fanatic Dens.*" I am the more anxious to remove the erroneous impression which these words appear to me likely to convey, as an opinion very extensively prevails, that the contents of the above-mentioned work *are merely the sentiments of the individual whose name it bears,*—an opinion eagerly, for obvious reasons, disseminated by the champions of the Church of Rome. If any one will take the pains to examine the work in question, he will find that it is, in fact, little else than *a digest of the opinions of the most celebrated Romish divines, of the canons of various Councils,* and of the Decretals, &c. of successive Popes. He will find, moreover, that, to most of the tracts an "Approbatio" is appended. Towards the conclusion of the approbation prefixed to the sixth volume, in which is contained the "Schemata practica," are these words: "Hisce igitur fundamentis innixus, hunc Tractatum de Pœnitentia *aliisque connexis,* luce publicâ Lectorumque utilitate dignum fore, absque hæsitatione existimo. Dabam Mechliniæ, die 18 Septembris 1758, J. F. FOPPERS, S.T.L." &c.

Even if the characteristic letter of Talleyrand should be deemed apocryphal, the dangerous tendency of the confessional is amply proved by the denunciation of more than one pope. In vol. vi. of Dens's Theology, pp. 292—3, under the head "De confessario sollicitante ad inhonesta et turpia," extracts are given from a Bull of Gregory XV., and a confirmation of the said Bull by Benedict XIV. The passages, however, are too revolting to admit of transcription into your pages. We are further told that Benedict XIV. again noticed the infamous conduct of confessors in a subsequent decree, and that it also fell under the notice of Alexander VII. In vol. viii. p. 178, we find the name of Sixtus V. connected with the denunciation of similar abuses of the confessional. It may perhaps be necessary, for the information of the reader, to state that the eighth volume of Peter *Dens's Theology* is a *supplemental volume;* and that, if we are to believe the announcement in the title page, PETER DENS is not responsible for its contents;* it professes to be an epitome of the works of Benedict XIV.

Of the nature of the questions which the priest is not only empowered, but *expected,* to put to the penitent, no doubt can for a moment be entertained by any one who is acquainted with the "examination on the commandments," &c. set forth in that accredited, popular, and widely-circulated (stereotyped) work, "The Garden of the Soul." It may indeed be thought that little further

* SUPPLEMENTUM huic novæ editioni Theologiæ moralis et dogmaticæ, &c. NUNC PRIMUM ANNEXUM. Tomus VIII., complectens epitomen ex operibus Benedicti XIV. &c.

injury can be done to the mind which has once been polluted by *dwelling* upon the disgusting matter contained in the preparation for confession, as directed in that manual. A singular acknowledgment of the mischief likely to arise from the perusal of such a revolting catalogue of crimes is made in a little work now before me, entitled, "Examen de Conscience, destiné principalement à l'Usage de la Jeunesse, &c." In p. 50 is the following notice:" Sur ce commandement (*vi. in the Romish decalogue*) nous n'avons mis dans l'examen les péchés les plus nécessaires à declarer, parce que *ce detail pourrait blesser la modestie;* mais le pénitent doit rechercher avec soin tout ce qui peut être opposé á la chasteté, *et le déclarer avec sincérité à son confesseur,* pour qu'il puisse juger de l' énormité du crime, et y apporter le remède convenable." We have, in the above notice, not only an acknowledgment of the injury likely to be received by the youthful mind from such a disgusting detail, but a further proof, if such were needed, of the indelicate nature of the questions which the penitent is expected to answer in the confessional of the Church of Rome.

J. E.

*** Will our judicious and reverend Correspondent forgive us for saying that it was not without reluctance that we have admitted his letter, though so guardedly worded, and containing such serious facts?—facts which ought to be widely known, especially at a period when the Church of Rome is zealously endeavouring to regain and enlarge her lost dominion; but which, as our correspondent justly says, cannot be *adequately* stated without offending against what is "convenient." We now close the discussion; but we must not omit to remind the reader that the evils of the Romish Confessional are not confined to those of one complexion; but are very extensive and direful in their character; as is shewn by another writer in our December Number.

ON THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Does not the following passage, in the 55th canon, clearly prove that those divines are altogether mistaken, who assert that the Church of England excludes from membership of Christs holy catholic church all except those who belong to her own communion, or that of the Church of Rome? The canon is entitled, "The Form of a Prayer to be used by all preachers before their sermons;" and the words to which I refer are these: "Ye shall pray for Christ's holy catholic church; *that is,* for the *whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world,* and especially for the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland," &c. I should like to be favoured with your opinion on this passage. To me it appears decisive of this much litigated question.

CLERICUS DUNELMENSIS.

*** As our Durham correspondent is pleased to ask for our opinion, we will give it. We do not ourselves, in the slightest degree, doubt that this canon acknowledges the Presbyterian church of Scotland as a sister church; but the reason why we have never quoted it is, that the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland were for

many years so unsettled, that some litigation might arise as to what the Convocation of 1603, which prepared and set forth our present book of canons, *meant* by the Church of Scotland. "From 1560 to 1578," remarks Mr. Lathbury, in his valuable and interesting History of English Episcopacy, "the government of the Scottish church was a mixture of episcopacy and presbytery; from the latter period till 1598 presbytery existed alone; after which moderate episcopacy prevailed until the period of the troubles." Such being the facts, rather than quote a document upon which any counter argument might be held—though, we think, unjustly—we have referred to the indubitable facts of the case; for it cannot be denied, that the Church of England did acknowledge the validity of Presbyterian ordination; nay, that Presbyters were for many years even allowed to minister within its pale, and to enjoy its preferments; nor did any one of our primates, from Cranmer to Howley, Laud only excepted, ever dispute the claim of the Protestant churches to be accounted portions of Christ's visible kingdom.

But in reprehending the Popish abuse of the doctrine of apostolical succession, we would ever keep in mind its sober and scriptural interpretation; for never can we question that our Divine Lord has always had a church, and that our portion of it is of apostolical lineage. But the Romanist view of the doctrine is superstitious and unwarranted by holy writ; and when espoused by any professed member of the Church of England, it is also as suicidal as it is unscriptural.

The Oxford Tract divines just give to Rome all that she asks as a basis for the establishment of her pretensions; while they undermine those principles upon which the Protestant reformation was grounded. They say that men's minds have been distracted by multiplicities of opinion; that some infallible way ought to be pointed out for distinguishing the true church of Christ from all false appearances; that there is one way, and but one; that the question whether a church holds pure doctrine is wholly beside the mark; that it is like trying to ascertain whether or not the crew of a man-of-war belong to the Queen, by inquiring into their seamanship and bravery, instead of looking at the muster roll or at their buttons; that the simple and sole question is, Are those who call themselves ministers really qualified "to impart the Trinity" in baptism, and so to consecrate the bread and wine in the Eucharist, that "by a divine gift," imparted to every priest in ordination, they convey the actual body and blood of Christ in such a manner, that even "an insensible person," having them placed in his mouth, eats and drinks Christ's body and blood, though he does not discern them? It were quite superfluous to go through four or five heavy volumes of these tracts, to prove or illustrate our statement. We open at the preface to the very first volume; and there we read, that "the sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine grace," and this in virtue of "the apostolical succession in the Holy Catholic Church"—the church being constantly substituted in these tracts for Christ, and the Gospel of Christ. We go on to the very first tract, and read, "The Lord Jesus gave his Spirit to his apostles; they in their turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us (the clergy) as their assistants, and in some sense representatives;" so that you, the clergy, in ruling the laity, need not appeal to the truth of the doctrines you set forth, as proved by Scripture; you stand on far higher ground; "the spirit of the apostles is on you;"—you may be a swearer, a drunkard, a Socinian, a scoffer; nevertheless, "Tell them of your gift;" for it is added, "the times will soon drive you to this, if you still mean to be any thing." The next tract, No. 2, on "the Catholic church,"

assumes the same ground; and No. 3, "On alterations in the Liturgy," tells us, that "our flocks regard *it*" [the Liturgy, not the Holy Scriptures, or in subordination to the Holy Scriptures, but without qualification] "as the stay of their faith and devotion;" to allow them to ask whether it might not be well "to omit *or otherwise word*" the clause "He descended into *hell*;" is "to make the weaker sort sceptical;" and to lead the unstable "to criticise" [that is, carefully to examine into, with the aid of God's holy word] "what they should never think of but as a divine voice supplied by the church for their need;" like the good Papists, who commit their souls to their priests in full reliance upon the infallibility of their church. No. 4, on "adherence to the apostolical succession," sustains the same lofty tone: it says that "We, the ministers of God," instead of occupying "the comparatively low ground" on which Protestant pastors are usually contented to rest the validity of their commission, ought "to appeal to that warrant which marks us, *exclusively*, for GOD'S AMBASSADORS;" (the italics and capitals are the tract-writer's) that "warrant," which proves that "our hands convey The Sacrifice;" which is as plain Popery as any thing in the Articles of Trent. We need not go on; for the first four tracts are an average specimen of the whole; or rather as they advance they become bolder; according to the "stealthy" suggestion of Mr. Froude's critic, that what was "too fierce" at first, and according to Dr. Pusey's remark might "startle" men's minds till accustomed to it, might "come in afterwards."

Now these popish pretensions, we repeat, are suicidal. We use the word suicidal upon the assumption that the writers do not really mean to injure the Church of England, or to aid the church of Rome; otherwise we must have said insidiously hostile. Protestantism mourns over them; while popery rejoices.*

* We have several times noticed the havoc which Dr. Wiseman and other Roman Catholic controversialists are making among unstable Protestants, by the aid of the suicidal admissions of the Oxford Tracts. The conductors of the Dublin Quarterly Review, edited by Dr. Wiseman, Mr. Quin, and Mr. O'Connell, have been lately fighting the Church of England, as usual, with weapons collected from the Oxford-Tract arsenal, in an article upon the English apostolical succession. The wary Jesuit, with his literary colleague, and their political coadjutor, early espied the advantage afforded by the Oxford Tract writers against the Protestant reformation, and they have not been sparing in using it. We have not seen their last Number; but a few passages from their very first, as long back as May 1836, will serve to indicate the intended course of their campaign. The thesis was professedly the controversy respecting Professor Hampden, but the reviewer took occasion to descant upon the principles urged by the writers of the "Tracts for the Times." The usual Jesuitical artifice runs throughout the paper, of confounding things essentially distinct; as if the Church of England were made up of Hampdenites and Puseyites; so that those who do not approve of the peculiar doctrines of the Oxford Tracts, are of course abettors of whatever was exceptionable in the writings of Dr. Hampden. But in point of fact it was not the Oxford Tract divines and their friends, active as they were, who formed the large majority against Dr. Hampden; but clergymen and laymen of very different sentiments, great numbers of whom went down to vote on the occasion, from their extreme disapprobation of Dr. Hampden's writings. Unhappily, however—and we greatly lamented it at the time—the local management of the opposition to Dr. Hampden being very much under the influence of Dr. Pusey and some of his friends, and the subtlety of the Oxford Tract poison not being then so generally discovered as now, the business was in public opinion too much identified with what had no real connexion with it. The report against Dr. Hampden complained that he had disregarded "those rules and principles of interpretation which have guided the judgments of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in all ages of its history;" which was perfectly true; and those who placed no faith in the authority of tradition, could conscientiously sign the declaration; but yet we could have wished that this

If any of our readers will refer to Bishop Burnet's "Vindication of the ordinations of the Church of England, in which it is demonstrated that all the essentials of ordination, according to the practice of the primitive and Greek churches,

appeal had been directly and decidedly to the inspired Scriptures; and, in subordination to these, to the formularies of that church of which Dr. Hampden is a member; rather than to some supposed traditional principles which have guided the judgments of the church catholic in all ages. This kind of language is susceptible of a Protestant interpretation; but that it is capable of one of a very different character may be inferred from the sarcastic interrogations of the Dublin Review: "Is this Oxford or Salamanca that speaks? Is it Corpus Christi College, or the Sorbonne?"

We will now give a few characteristic extracts; and let the reader observe with what confidence Dr. Wiseman and his colleagues claim Dr. Pusey and his friends as their own; affirming that their doctrines are not, and never have been, those of the Anglican church; and that they are those of Romanism, only marred in the handling. They say:—

"We see learned and zealous, and we have reason to believe, in some instances, amiable men, contending, *in the spirit which belongs to a better church and a better cause*, in favour of a rigid adherence to principles and doctrines which *we* must approve; yet, thereby departing from the consistency of their professed faith, and betraying how powerless they are in wielding the weapons which it has long since blunted, and then thrown aside."

"It is not difficult to discover the secret springs which have been here at work; and inasmuch as therein are found the latent germs of principles which we would gladly see avowed in the face of heaven, we must feel an interest in watching the course of the accusation."

"The party in the church, to which Dr. Hampden's impugners [The majority of Dr. Hampden's impugners belonged not to this "party"] belong, hold their only true and semi-visible church to have existed pure, until this day, *amidst the wilder theories of Protestantism*; always bearing with it some precious remnants and relics of good old Catholicity, upholding the authoritative teaching of Christ's Church, and the true efficacy of his sacraments, and reverencing and perhaps regretting many of those institutions which the hurricane of the Reformation recklessly swept away."

"We doubt not that those who signed the report would seriously and earnestly maintain that such has always been the conduct and the belief of their church. Alas! we wish it had been so. For had these principles been always practically upheld in England, never would the sad separation have occurred, which has rent this country from its mother Church. Others, however, will not so easily see the conformity between these principles and those whereon the Reformation was originally based, but will refuse to believe that the thick wall of separation which it was intended at the era of that event to place between Popery and the new religions, was in reality so thin a film as it must here appear."

"It is only another illustration of what Catholics have repeatedly observed, that if two contending parties arise in the Protestant church, the one is driven to tax the other with Socinianism, and that other retorts with the accusation of Popery. It only confirms what every Catholic must feel, that the rejection of a principle of authority necessarily leads, theoretically at least, to the rejection of all mystery, and so to Socinianism, while its adoption obliges its supporter to reason on principles purely Catholic. This tendency of the party at Oxford to run into Catholic principles for shelter, has necessarily attracted the attention of many."

"If they would fearlessly pursue their own doctrines to their farthest consistent conclusions, they would surely find that they have unguardedly, perhaps unknowingly, rejected the principles of the Reformation, and returned to thoughts and feelings which belong to other times, or at least to another church."

"Nothing can be more clear, than that, in the Established Church, there has been a series of learned divines whose opinions approximated greatly to those of Catholics; who thought that the Reformation, however necessary, overdid its work. They have regretted the licentiousness of religious opinion which it introduced, by removing the wholesome and necessary restraint of a dogmatic authority in the church. But is it fair to identify the opinions of these men, however learned, with the establishment to which they belonged? Were they, in the first place, ever considered otherwise than as a party, or, if you prefer it, a *part* of the Anglican church? Were there not

are still retained in our church; in answer to a paper written by one of the Church of Rome to prove the nullity of our orders, and given to a person of quality;" they will see the exceeding injury which the Oxford Tract extravagant doctrine upon Apostolical succession (which is not the true Anglican or Scriptural doctrine, but the Romish) is likely to do to our apostolical church, and to the Reformation in general; indeed we may say to our common Christianity. As the work is not generally to be met with (our copy is the first edition, 1677), we will transcribe a few passages. The following is well worth attention. The bishop is saying that it is urged against us by the Papists that "we have not the power of making God present on our altars, as they have, nor the power of absolving from sins;" and, he might have added, "of imparting the Trinity in baptism." His reply is that we do not pretend to it; and he well knew that if we did, the Papist would soon conquer us in confident assumptions; so that the argument which these Oxford divines are now vamping up anew to quell the exclusive pretensions of Popery, has been long ago, and from the first, rejected by all sound Protestant divines. The cavil about "the Protestant churches beyond

---

always many who opposed them in their views? Can it even be said that the great body of the flock followed them in their doctrines, and claimed not, rather in their despite, the privilege of individual judgment? And has not the growing increase of sectarianism proved that the body of their church insists on this right, and exercises it to the utmost? And, in the second place, is not the very complaint, so constantly uttered by this party, of too much having been done at the Reformation, the regret that outward pomp of worship, and many religious institutions, were then abolished, a sufficient proof that they represent not those who caused and accomplished that unhappy Revolution?

"No one, we believe, save themselves, will maintain that they represent the English church, such as the Reformation intended it to appear, in harsh and unyielding contrast to the Catholic doctrine on the subject."

"Divines of this class, whether living or dead, have been more than once subservient to the spread of Catholicity. The late Mr. Vaughan of Leicester, was ever most assiduous in preaching to his Protestant flock, on the High-church doctrine of authority in matters of faith, on the sin of dissent, and the unsafety of those who submitted and adhered not to the church; and the consequence was, that several of his congregation, convinced by his arguments, but following them up to their real conclusions, passed over to the Catholic faith, and became zealous members of our holy religion. We had the pleasure of being acquainted with one who for years had exercised the ministry in the Established religion, but became a convert to the truth, and, in his old age, took orders in the church. We asked him, on one occasion, by what course he had been brought to embrace our religion, with so many sacrifices. He informed us, that he had always been a zealous High Churchman, and had studied and held the opinions of the old [No, not the old,—but the innovating Laudite] English divines. He had thus firmly upheld the authority of the church; he had believed in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed Eucharist; he had regretted the destruction of ceremony and religious symbols in worship, and had fully satisfied himself, on the authority of his leaders, that many Catholic practices, usually much decried, were blameless, and might be even salutary. His religious principles being thus formed upon the doctrines of that school, he could not avoid noticing that, practically, they were not held by the church in which he had learnt them; he looked around him for some place where they might be found, and, to his astonishment, discovered, that among Catholics his theory of Christianity alone existed in a perfect and harmonious scheme. He had little or nothing to change; he merely transferred his allegiance from a party to a church, and became a Catholic, that he might remain a consistent Protestant!"

Such were the views of Dr. Wiseman, and other sagacious Romanists, nearly three years ago; what must be their triumph, and how bitter their sarcasms, NOW? Has the boast of the Oxford Tract divines, that theirs is the only weapon with which we can cope with Rome with hope of success, been fulfilled?

the seas," he treats very lightly; as all the divines of the Church of England, except those of the Laud and non-juring school, have done. We acknowledge them as sister churches; but we rejoice that we have what we believe to be a more excellent way; "we ascribe," he justly says, "all due honour to holy orders and the succession of pastors;" and though "we do not extol the office of the priesthood to that height as to say that the priest can by a few words do the greatest miracle that ever was, *and make God present*," we claim for our orders all the regularity and succession that Rome can exhibit for hers, with the addition that our ordination conforms to the primitive type, which theirs does not. But let us give Burnet's own words:

"Among the many unjust and spiteful calumnies, with which the clergy of the Roman communion study to asperse and disgrace the Reformation, there are none more frequently made use of than these, that there are no pastors lawfully called or ordained among us; *that we have not the power of making God present on our altars, as they have, nor the power of absolving from sins*, much less of redeeming souls from the miseries they are under in another state. They tell their credulous followers, that we were all at first no better than a company of tub-preachers; and that all the disorders we saw of that sort during the late wars, were as justifiable as the first beginnings of the Reformation. And though the ridiculous fable of the Nag's-head be so manifest a forgery, supported by no good evidence and overthrown by the authority of so many public records, besides many other clear presumptions from the state of things, and the time in which that was said to be done, that one might very reasonably expect that all sober or discreet persons should be ashamed of so foul an imposture, yet it serves them still for many a good turn, and so they will never lay it down; though I dare boldly say there is no matter of fact of which there are no surviving witnesses, that can be demonstrated with clearer evidences than the regularity and canonicalness of the ordination of Archbishop Parker. Others, that are not so lost in impudence, yet say that though we have a shadow of a succession among us, yet we shew how little regard we have to orders, when we acknowledge the Protestant churches beyond the seas to be true churches, though many of them do not so much as pretend to a continued succession of pastors.

"For the foreign churches, they are able to speak for themselves; nor is it needful for me here to shew what grounds there are for our churches holding communion with them. But it must be acknowledged to be a high pitch of boldness and injustice to charge us, as if we did not ascribe all due honour to holy orders and the succession of Pastors. We know and assert, that 'no man can take this honour (of priesthood) to himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron: so also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.' We reject the extravagant and bold pretences of hot-headed or factious enthusiasts, and have learned out of the Gospel that a public calling was necessary, even to those who had the most extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost. Our Saviour sent his disciples as his Father had sent him; and laid his hands on them, and gave them the power of binding and loosing. And though God had by his Spirit called Saul and Barnabas to the apostleship of the Gentiles, yet they did not enter upon the discharge of that function, till, by the direction of the Holy Ghost, (whether by a voice formed in the air, or by a secret inspiration, it matters not,) they were separated for the work of the ministry, by prayer and imposition of hands. And though Timothy was by some prophecies marked out as a sacred person, yet he was received into that function by the imposition of St. Paul's hands. From these sacred authorities, backed with the constant doctrine and practice of the churches of God, in all ages, we do hold a visible vocation and ordination of pastors necessary in the church.

"But whether the Roman pontifical, or our ordinal, comes nearer the rules and instances in Scripture, and the forms of the primitive times, for at least eight hundred years, any that will compare them will easily discern, and it is the subject of the following work fully to evince, the advantage of our forms beyond theirs.

"It is true, we do not extol the office of priesthood to that height as to say, The priest can by a few words work the greatest miracle that ever was, and can make God present, (as they love to phrase it,) this, we think, is the honouring the creature more than the Creator."

We will now copy from the "Nullity" paper, as transcribed by Burnet, a passage which shews what use the Papists make of the doctrine, that in holy orders is conferred an actual personal "gift" of imparting the Trinity in baptism, and converting the eucharistic emblems into the body and blood of Christ, and offering a real sacrifice;—whether it be called actual or commemorative makes no difference to the argument.

"First then I prove that the ministers of the Church of England are no Priests, through the defect of the Form of Ordination, which was this, pronounced to every one of them when they came to be ordained: 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou forgivest they are forgiven, whose sins thou retainest, they are retained; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and his Holy Sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.' After which the Bishop delivers a Bible to him, saying, 'Take thou authority to preach the word, and minister the holy sacraments, in the congregation where thou shalt be so appointed.'

"And my first reason is, because this Form wants one essential part of priesthood, which is to consecrate the most holy sacrament of Christ's body and blood, giving only power to administer this sacrament, which any deacon may do.

"Secondly, Because it wants another essential part, which is, to offer sacrifice, which the Apostle requires, Heb. v. 1, saying, 'Every High Priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifice for sins.'

"Thirdly, Because those words, 'Whose sins, &c.' at most gave power to forgive sins, and not to consecrate and offer sacrifice, having nothing to signify that which is the chief office of priesthood."

This is intended to prove the invalidity of our orders as priests—in the sense of sacrificers; which we cheerfully admit we are not, but only presbyters. Of our bishops this wily Romanist says:

"They are no Bishops, because their form of ordination is essentially invalid and null; seeing it cannot be valid, (no more than that of priesthood) unless it be in fit words which signifies the order given; as Mr. Mason says, in his Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, lib. i. c. 16. n. 6. in these terms, 'Not any words can serve for this Institution, but such as are fit to express the power of the order given.' And the reason is evident, because ordination being a sacrament (as the same author says, lib. i. n. 8, and Doctor Bramhal, page 96, of the consecration of Protestant bishops), that is a visible sign of invisible grace given by it. There must be some visible sign or words in the form of it, to signify the power given, and to determine the matter (which is the imposition of hands, of itself a dumb sign, and common to priests and deacons, confirming, curing, &c.) to the grace of episcopal order; otherwise it were sufficient to say at the imposition of hands, 'Be thou a constable, or God make thee an honest man.' But there is no such visible sign or words in the Protestant form, expressing this episcopal power given; therefore no such power is given. That there is no such sign or words in the Protestant form, I prove out of the form itself, which is this (made in King Edward the Sixth's time, and continued till the happy restoration of his Majesty that now is), 'Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God that is in thee by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and soberness.' In which is not any word signifying episcopal power or ordination; and therefore for this defect in their Form they are no true Bishops.

"Against what has been said you will object, first, That I prove them to be Priests because they are no Bishops that made them: and on the other side I prove them no Bishops, because they are no Priests; which is a vicious circle. But I easily answer this, because I first prove à priori, that is, from the essential which ought to give being to each of them, that they are severally null; and each of them being null for that reason, it is evident, that it is a cause of invalidity in the other, for as he can be no Bishop who is proved to be no Priest, so he can make no Priest, who is proved to be no Bishop.

"Secondly, You will object and salve up all the defects afore-mentioned in one word, to wit, that although the form used in the Church of England were invalid in King Edward's, Queen Elizabeth's, King James's, and King Charles the First's time, for want of a valid Form of Ordination, yet now it is valid in our Sovereign King Charles the Second's, with whom the Parliament now sitting hath appointed a true Form, enacting, that for the future, to wit, after St.

Bartholomew's Day, 1662, the Form of ordaining a Priest should be, Receive the Holy Ghost for the office of a Priest: and of a Bishop, Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop.

"But to this I'll answer you in another word, That the salve is worse than the sore; because by this change of the Form before established, they acknowledge it to be null; for why else need they change it? Secondly, By it they in effect acknowledge all their Bishops and Priests till that time to be null, because ordained by a form that was null and could not give power it had not, nor signified. Thirdly, Because being no Bishops already, they cannot ordain validly by any Form whatsoever; for no man can give what he has not, as has been said before."

We sincerely believe that upon the non-spiritual principles assumed by the objector, the orders of the Church of England would be invalid. But it is mere vanity to argue such questions; for the assumed difficulty rests only on what superstition added to the ministerial office, not what God attached to it. Burnet's reply goes into the details; but even if we had space for them, we should deem them superfluous to a scripturally enlightened mind. We will copy only a short specimen:

"It is strange inconsideration to argue from the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the pastors of the Christian Church ought to be Priests in the sense that is mentioned in that Epistle; the scope of which is to prove, That Christ is the only Priest of this new dispensation: and the notion of a Priest in that Epistle, is 'a person called and consecrated to offer some living sacrifice, and to slay it, and by the shedding of the blood of the sacrifice slain, to make reconciliation:' this being the sense in which the Jews understood it; the Apostle among other arguments to prove the death of Christ to be the true sacrifice, brings this for one, that there was to be another Priesthood after the order of Melchisedeck. For proving this, he lays down, in the first four verses of the 5th chapter, the Jewish notion of a Priest; then he goes on to prove that Christ was such a Priest called of God and consecrated; this he prosecutes more fully in the 7th chapter, where he asserts that Christ was 'that other Priest after the order of Melchisedeck,' and v. 15, he calls him 'another Priest,' and v. 23 and 24, makes this plainer in these words, 'And they truly were many Priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood:' from which it is apparent that the Apostle's design in these places is that there is but one Priest in that sense mentioned, chap. 5, v. 1, under the New Testament. And had the writer of this paper read over that Epistle, he must needs have seen this; but this is one of the effects of their not reading the Scriptures carefully, that they make use of places of Scripture, never considering any thing more than the general sound of some words, without examining what goes along with them.

"But as it is clear from that Epistle, that there is but one Priest in the strict notion of it; so it is no less clear that there is but one propitiatory sacrifice among Christians in its strict notion, for having mentioned the frequent oblations to take away sins under the Mosaical law, ch. v. 3, he makes the opposition clear ch. vii. 27, in these words: 'Who needeth not daily, as those High-Priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people; for this he did once when he offered up himself.' And chap. ix. 7, having mentioned the High-Priest's annual entering into the Most Holy Place, he sets in opposition to it, verse 12, 'Christ entering in once to the holy place, having made redemption for us by his own blood.' And verse 22, he says, 'Without shedding of blood there was no remission; by which he does clearly put down all unbloody sacrifices, that are propitiatory; and verse 28, he says, 'Christ was offered once to bear the sins of many.' And chap. x. 2, he says, 'That when the worshippers are once purged, then would not sacrifices cease to be offered?' to prove that the sacrifices of the law had not that virtue; therefore we being purged by the blood of Christ, must offer no more propitiatory sacrifices; and all this is made yet clearer, verses 11, 12, 'And every priest stands daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never take away sins. But this man, after he had offered up one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. From all which you may see it as plain as can be, that there is but one Priest and one propitiatory sacrifice under the New Testament; for the places I have cited are not some ambiguous or dark expressions, but full and formal proofs, by which, in a long series of discourse and argument, the thing is put out of doubt. Therefore those of that church do very unwisely ever to mention that Epistle, or to say anything that may oblige people to look upon it; so that, except to such as they are sure

will read no more of it than they will shew them, or cite to them, they had best speak of it to nobody else.

"Secondly, Though we deny all propitiatory sacrifices, but that which our blessed Saviour offered for us once on the cross; yet we acknowledge that we have sacrifices in the true, strict, and scriptural notion of that word; for propitiatory ones are but one sort of sacrifice, which in its general notion stands for any holy oblations made to God; and in this sense, Thank-offerings, Peace-offerings, and Free-will-offerings, were sacrifices under the law: so were also their commemorative sacrifices of the Paschal Lamb, which were all sacrifices, though not propitiatory. And in this sense our prayers and praises, a broken heart, and the dedicating our lives to the service of God, are sacrifices, and are so called in Scripture; so also is the giving of alms. And in this sense we deny not but the holy eucharist is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and it is so called in one of the Collects It is also *a commemoration of that one sacrifice* which it represents, and by which the worthy receivers have the virtue of that applied to them. The oblation of the elements of bread and wine to be sanctified, is also a kind of sacrifice; and in all these senses we acknowledge the sacrament to be a true sacrifice, as the primitive church did."

We fully believe that this is the doctrine of the Church of England; and that those are not her true children, and are doing her much injury, who claim priesthood in the Popish sense; and profess to give the real body and blood of Christ to the people—a body which may be verily and indeed eaten by "an insensible person," and blood which may be "poured out on the pavement"—and to "offer them to the Father as a commemorative sacrifice," instead of scripturally making a commemoration of the sacrifice once offered.

We will quote from Burnet only one passage more; and a very important one it is. It shews the worse than folly, the extreme mischief, of reviving these almost obsolete questions of vain scruple or unwarranted pretension. The concluding words respecting "the true touchstone of a church" ought to be written in letters of gold; though in truth they convey only what every Protestant Christian acknowledges as an indisputable article of his belief.

"Thus far I have complied with your desires of answering the paper you sent me, in as short and clear terms as I could. But I must add, that this ransacking of records about a succession of orders, though it adds much to the lustre and beauty of the Church, yet is not a thing incumbent on everybody to look much into, nor indeed, possible for any to be satisfied about: for a great many ages, all those instruments are lost; so that how ordinations were made in the primitive church, we cannot certainly know; it is a piece of history, and very hard to be perfectly known. Therefore it cannot be a fit study for any, much less for one that has not much leisure. The condition of Christians were very hard, if private persons must certainly know how all ministers have been ordained since the Apostles' days; for if we will raise scruples in this matter, it is impossible to satisfy them, unless the authentic registers of all the ages of the church could be shewed, which is impossible; for though we were satisfied that all the priests of this age were duly ordained; yet if we be not as sure that all who ordained them had orders rightly given them, and so upward, till the days of the Apostles, the doubt will still remain. Therefore it is an unjust and unreasonable thing to raise difficulties in this matter. And, indeed, if we go to such nice scruples with it, there is one thing in the Church of Rome that gives a much juster ground these, than any thing that can be pretended in ours does; which is, the doctrine of the intention of the minister being necessary to make a sacrament. Secret intentions are only known to God, and not possible to be known by any man: therefore since they make orders a sacrament, there remains still ground to entertain a scruple whether orders be truly given. And this can never be cleared, since none can know other men's thought or intentions.

"Therefore the pursuing nice scruples about this cannot be a thing indispensably necessary, otherwise all people must be perplexed with endless disquiet and doubtings. *But the true touchstone of a church must be the purity of her doctrine, and the conformity of her faith with that which Christ and his Apostles taught. In this the Scriptures are clear and plain to every one that will read and consider them sincerely and without prejudice, which that you may do, and by these may be led and guided into all truth, shall be my constant prayer to God for you*".

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

RECENT SERMONS.

1. *Sermons delivered in India during the course of the Primary Visitation,* by D. WILSON D.D., Bishop of Calcutta, and Metropolitan.
2. *Sermons for every Sunday in the Year,* preached at Hodnet, Salop, by the late Bishop HEBER. (Edited by Sir R. H. INGLIS, Bart.)
3. *Twenty-one Sermons,* chiefly preached in Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, by the Rev. B. W. MATTHIAS.
4. *Sermons on Various Subjects, with Three Lectures on Ruth;* by the Rev. H. WOODWARD, Rector of Fethard (Tipperary), in the Diocese of Cashel.
5. *Sermons,* by the Rev. HENRY MELVILL, B.D., (2nd volume, 1838.)
6. *A Series of Practical Sermons,* by the Rev. C. BRADLEY, (2nd volume, 1838.)
7. *Practical Exposition of the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia,* by the Rev. HENRY BLUNT, A.M.

WE cannot, as Christian Observers, close another annual portion of our labours more becomingly, than with a few passages from some of the numerous volumes of sermons which have gathered around us during the year. They are but a sample; for volumes of sermons are far too multitudinous to be reviewed in detail in ours or any other miscellany; and we may have erred in the selection; but we have taken a few which appeared to us, from the station, talents, or celebrity of the writers, or from peculiar intrinsic claims to notice, or from several of these combined, most likely to interest our readers; though with the two-fold discouragement that we must pass over many others which we should gladly mention; and that of those mentioned, our brief space shews rather our wish than its gratification.

At the head of the list, we have named the recent volume of that much-esteemed and eminently useful prelate whom God in his mercy has placed over the church of Christ in India. Much as we honoured Daniel Wilson in England, and large as were our hopes of the blessings which his episcopal labours would be the means, in the hand of God, of conferring upon the country placed under his spiritual rule, his career has even surpassed our expectations. We look with admiration and gratitude upon his labours; the extent and efficacy of which are amply attested in the interesting communications made from time to time at the Board of the Christian Knowledge Society, and other kindred institutions. That he is intensely fervid, resolutely bold, and indefatigably persevering, a man of large views and comprehensive measures, is but to say that he continues in India what, by the grace of God, he was in England. To add that with these qualities he has been enabled to unite a calm judgment, sound discretion, practical wisdom, and much of tenderness, conciliation, and forbearance, is to say, in other words, that he is peculiarly qualified for the arduous office of an ecclesiastical ruler. But that

which is the climax of all, as it is its foundation, is that in these discourses we trace the same clear, fearless, well-poised, and thoroughly scriptural exhibition of evangelical truth, which has so long strikingly characterized the preaching of this well-instructed scribe in the kingdom of God. Every discourse in the volume lucidly expresses, or essentially involves, the cardinal doctrines of Holy Writ respecting the fall and recovery of lost mankind; yet not with a trite round of commonplace reiterations, but with well-digested, well thought-out matter; for Bishop Wilson, with all his ready and powerful eloquence, has earned the yet higher meed, and set the more useful example, of being an indefatigably pains-taking sermon writer. He does not seize a subject and descant upon it in the off-hand consecutive flow of an essay; but he collects, by frequent thought and diligent reading, the main points of argument and illustration, and places them under distinct heads, that they may be the better understood, and more easily remembered. He builds up, rather than lets off a sermon; and to those who seek for solid instruction, the matter thus accumulated is of great value. The reader always feels that he wishes to convince and persuade him for his good; that he is a man altogether in earnest; that he will not be contented with approbation or admiration; but that he wishes to win souls to Christ; and that, in short, his discourses *mean something*.

The volume is thrown into four divisions; the first relates to the chief doctrines of Christianity; the second, to the application of those doctrines to the human heart; the third, to some of their effects upon the life and conduct; the last, to the expected and advancing consummation of Christianity, in the conversion of the world. The discourses were delivered to various congregations in different parts of India during his Lordship's arduous Visitation; and were prepared for press during a visit to the hills of Simla in the hot season, in order that his comparative leisure might not be fruitless. We can extract only a few paragraphs.

The following is a portion of the conclusion of the first sermon:

"View Christianity in its simplicity, in order to catch its genuine tendency. Separate it from admixtures. Abstract its essence. Lay aside the additions and incrustations of men. Remove from your view for a moment even its primitive and necessary creeds and forms of discipline—such as those of our own and other apostolical churches. Take it as it was exhibited in the character, and described in the doctrines, of our Lord and his Apostles; and you will more clearly see its beneficial operation. Men are bewildered by a thousand things being represented as flowing from Christianity, which have merely co-existed with it, or arisen from the judgment and opinions of man. Christianity did not occasion or create the evil in the world. No; it found it there. Whether it be received as a revelation from God or not, the misery and blindness of man exist the same; the fall of man is the same; the violence of human passions the same. Mark then the gentle, holy current of Christianity, as she flows through the world, opposing all evil, undoing every yoke, speaking pardon to guilty, and freedom to captive man; laying down the doctrine of the atonement of Christ as the foundation of hope; and dispensing the aids of the Holy Spirit to enable man to build upon it for eternity."

The following are mentioned as some of the ways in which Christians may be spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit.

"The unnatural commixture of temporary party politics with religion, and the union for a time of some religious portions of the public with Infidels, Socinians, and Papists, to overthrow those establishments which are amongst the chief safeguards of Christianity in Europe, and to divorce our country from the Christianity which sanctifies

and upholds it, is another instance of the vain deceit against which our apostle guards his converts.

"The common apophthegms, also, that knowledge is power, in the sense of mere intellectual attainment being capable of reforming the world—that opinions are innocent; that men are not accountable for their belief; that the morals of Christianity are indeed good, but that her mysteries are of little value; that the doctrines of the Gospel chiefly rest on scholastic refinements; that a civil and external utility to the greater number is every thing,—are other proofs of the existing danger.

"The loose and ambiguous language sometimes held as to the merely human or ecclesiastical authority, as it is termed, of the Lord's day, and on the credibility of the Bible in opposition to its divine inspiration, is of the same class.

"So are the rash and hazardous overstatements on topics connected with geology; confessedly hypothetical as much of the theory is, and feeble as is at present the induction of facts—as if the generally received exposition of the Mosaical account of the creation were doubtful.

"The affectation, also, of a philosophical and abstruse style in describing the mysteries of the gospel; the use of general and tame language; a cold and jejune description of doctrines, which evaporates all their spirit in a mass of words, and phrases, and arguments, unintelligible to the poor, and uninfluential upon the conscience; and the dread of the old-fashioned plain language of Holy Scripture;—all this savours of the philosophy and vain deceit of the age.

'The check to these evils, the answer to all these encroachments, is, 'We are complete in Christ.'"

There is an interesting sermon, entitled, "The memory strengthened for retaining religious truth." Among the means prescribed for this purpose, are, attention in its first reception; occasional reviews of the arguments in favour of the Gospel; the daily use of its doctrines and precepts; blending the affections with it; shunning scenes hostile to Christian recollections; arrangement; avoiding new and violent impressions; diligent use of the means of grace; meditation; and prayer for a sanctified memory. The whole is comprised in one aphorism, We remember what we love.

The concluding sermon was preached on occasion of the lamented death of Bishop Corrie. His surviving brother speaks with much affection of his labours and character.

We have placed next to Bishop Wilson's sermons those of Heber, delivered in England as a parochial minister, before his appointment to the see of Calcutta. They were published last year, and are therefore rather beyond our present chronology; but they ought not to be passed by; for they are a beautiful exhibition of the lovely characteristics of Bishop Heber's tender and devout mind; and of his earnest solicitude for the spiritual and temporal welfare of his flock; though our statement would be inconsistent with our former notices of his works during his life-time, if we did not add that their statements of Christian doctrine are very far from being so full, clear, or correct, as those of the present Bishop of Calcutta. To speak of the glowing style and radiant imagery of the author of Palestine, would be quite superfluous.

As our remarks will reach our readers at the commencement of the season of Advent, we will quote the following practical application of one of the Advent sermons.

"Since the most frequent source of religious disputes is a too great attention to trifles, (or to what are trifles in comparison to the great concerns of a Christian;) it is plain that the likeliest way to prevent, or to cure them, is to possess our own minds, and the minds of those over whom we have influence, with an overpowering and exclusive sense of the mighty things which Christ has done for us; of the extent of our hope, if we continue in His love, and of the greatness of our danger, if we fall away from it. He who is, in good earnest, striving for a kingdom, will have little time to criticise the uniform of his fellow soldiers: he, whose eyes

and ears and thoughts and heart are bent incessantly on the goodness and glories of a Redeemer, will have neither inclination nor leisure to find fault with such frivolous differences as have given rise to the greater part of Christian schisms."

"So far from persecution being the fruit of too much zeal in God's cause, it is, for the most part, a sure mark of too little; and he, who has himself been really made to tremble and to burn with the Seraphim before the Eternal Throne, can hardly either hate, or tyrannise over, his brother."

Returning homewards from India we shall not go far out of our way if we touch at Ireland, to take on board the discourses of Mr. Matthias and Mr. Woodward.

Mr. Matthias is not much known as a writer; but no man in Ireland is better known as a faithful and affectionate preacher of Christ Jesus the Lord, and as a zealous labourer, during many a year, in works of charity and piety. To preach "the unsearchable riches of Christ," was his aim during his life of lengthened usefulness; and now in age and weakness he has issued the present volume, as a parting memorial of his exertions.

The first discourse is interesting, as having been addressed six and thirty years ago, to a society of clergymen in the county of Down. Had the Irish clergy generally been at that time what Mr. Matthias was, and what he urged them to be, and what vast numbers of them now are, we do not believe that, in the ordinary providence of God, the overwhelming rebuke and blasphemy of the enemy would have been permitted. The Church of Ireland was weak, because she had been unfaithful to her high trust.

Mr. Woodward is another veteran in the cause of pure and undefiled religion in Ireland. His discourses are marked by such striking originality, fervid eloquence, classical beauty of style, deep knowledge of the human heart, and anxiety to shew the inseparable combination of Christ our sacrifice, with Christ our example, that we should lament even more than we do that we have not space to do justice to the volume before us, if our review of the former volume (Christian Observer 1836, pp. 35, 105,) had not lightened our burden of obligation; and, we may add, exempted us from the necessity of repeating our exceptive remarks upon some peculiar speculations of the ingenious writer. That our estimate of the former volume was not overcharged, seems proved by the fact that three editions of it have been already required. Three rapid editions of a volume of sermons is not now-a-days a very common occurrence; but such a demand for a volume issuing from a provincial town in the heart of the barbarian regions of Tipperary is somewhat of a curiosity;—we say barbarian regions; for if there was soundness in the logic of the traveller, who, after long wandering among savages, coming at length in sight of a gibbet, was grateful for his restoration to a civilized land, Tipperary (where midnight —aye, and daylight—murder, it were scarcely exaggeration to say, is almost as common, excites almost as little notice, and finds almost as much impunity, as poaching for rabbits in an English warren), is not a civilized territory. Yet in a place like this,—thanks to the admirable provisions of our Protestant Episcopal Church Establishment,—is found ministering to his flock in spiritual things, and instructing, comforting, and aiding them even in the minor exigencies of domestic and social life, a man of high education, elegant mind, benevolent disposition, zealous assiduity,—a friend and civiliser as well as a spiritual guide; and assisted, if we may venture to use our private infor-

mation, by a reverend coadjutor to whom we might apply all that we have said of the incumbent of Fethard: and whose discourses, to our knowledge,—we must not lift the visor too high,—would edify and delight the most select class of the most select metropolitan or academical congregation, whether for talent or piety. Yet these are the men whom "Evangelical Dissenters" would thrust out of the vineyard, to expose it to the incursions of the wild boar of the forest—no unapt metaphor for too many of the Maynooth priesthood.

Mr. Woodward incidentally exhibits the object of his volume in the following words:

"If it be made the humble instrument of bringing some who are weary and heavy-laden, to the only rest for man, some wandering sheep to the only Shepherd of the soul; if it be the means of convincing some self-approving sinners, that the blood of Jesus Christ, alone, can present us, with acceptance, in the light of the glory of the presence of God,—of turning the footsteps of some lambs of the flock, into those sweet pastures, whose ways are ways of pleasantness, and all whose paths are peace,—or of pointing out to some weather-beaten voyager, on the world's tempestuous ocean, that he may enter the haven, even at the eleventh hour, and turn the close of this life's evening, into the morning of never-ending day;—if these blessed objects are accomplished,—nay, if even one of them is attained, in but a solitary instance, the design of these humble pages has been answered, and the feeble prayers of their Author have been heard."

The Lectures upon Ruth, which the author has put forth only to test how far "the religious [part of the] public" would approve this style of discoursing upon Old Testament narratives, are to our minds the most interesting part of the volume. A portion of the concluding Lecture will strikingly exhibit Mr. Woodward's manner; his glowing style, his warm devotion, his refined use of an illustrative remark or anecdote, and, we may add, some slight characteristic touch of peculiarity of statement.

"So far we can accommodate this interesting portion of Scripture, to the purpose we have had in view. But the analogy, it will be said, can hold no further. For how can the following words, 'The Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me;'—how can such expressions be employed by a Christian, in reference to his Saviour? How can one that liveth, and believeth, and shall never die, thus bespeak the source of life, 'the King, eternal, immortal, invisible,' 'the Lord, the everlasting God?' How can death part between the deathless fountain, and the deathless stream? So far, it would be an unwarrantable perversion of language, and profane abuse of Scripture, to apply these latter words, in any sense, to the point in hand. Nevertheless, that deep devotedness, and generous attachment, which this form of imprecation implies, 'The Lord do so to me, and more also;'—those who unfeignedly love God, will need no prompter to suggest, as the spontaneous movement of their own hearts. I do not mean to put asunder what God has joined together; or to insinuate that we can love God, irrespectively of our own chiefest good, and exceeding great reward. For to love him, and be blessed; to give our whole hearts to God, and to be happy; are but the same inestimable blessing, viewed in two different aspects. Notwithstanding, I do say, that the soul which has tasted of his goodness, and which owns its debt of endless gratitude to a dying Saviour, would, in the contemplation of its own apostacy, turn with abhorrence upon itself; and feel that indignation, that zeal, and that revenge, of which the Apostle Paul so emphatically speaks. It is not that the man who feels this generous inspiration, coldly calculates even upon the possibility of his flying in the face of his Almighty Benefactor. His detestation of the thing is his felt assurance, that, amidst all his infirmities and sins, in the sin of unfaithfulness, the gates of hell shall not prevail against him. In such a case, no loyal heart would refuse the test of imprecating just judgment on its own delinquency."

"A pious woman, wife of a serjeant, whose regiment was quartered in my neighbourhood, was invited to attend the preaching of a Unitarian minister; and, upon her refusal, great solicitation was used. Amongst other arguments, it was said; 'Why no one wants you to be convinced against your will. It

is mere prejudice, that would object to hear the fair merits of a case. All that we want of you, is to weigh the proofs which can be adduced from Scripture; and then to determine, on which side the truth lies.' To which she replied, in 'words that burn.' 'Truth!' she said, 'I should hate truth, if it could persuade me that my Saviour was not God. Nay, if that were proved, I should not care whether there was a God at all. My only wish would be that I never was born.'

"But all this may be pronounced by some, bigoted, wild, and frantic. To me, however, it appears in a far different light. I never met, in spite of all her ardour, a more sober-minded Christian, than the one in question; one who better knew her innate depravity; who more thoroughly renounced her own righteousness as filthy rags; or who trusted with a more simple faith, to the alone merits of a Saviour. But that Saviour's death, and sufferings, and sorrows had won her heart; and she desired neither life nor heaven, without him.

"This is what I would term true loyalty of heart. I do not call it disinterested affection. Strictly speaking, there can be no such thing, in reference to God; for we know that all things work together for good, to them that love him. Neither do I say, that it can be irrespective of our own salvation; for love like this is salvation. The man who bears this jewel in his breast, is not a mere expectant—he is saved already. This charity never faileth; this love can never die; for it is the seed of immortality, and the dawning of endless day. 'Herein,' says the Apostle, 'is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment.' He who loves his Saviour for his own sake, will not fear to meet him face to face, upon that tremendous, that glorious day. It is true, that when he sees his blessed Lord and Master, wearing upon that brow which was once pierced with thorns, his many crowns of glory; and bearing in that hand which was once transfixed with nails, the sceptre of universal empire;—all thoughts of selfish interests will be lost, in the shouts and acclamations of saints and angels, to the once despised, but now exalted Saviour. But though he may forget himself, he will not be forgotten by the Judge of quick and dead. His all-seeing eye will search him out, amidst the countless millions which crowd around the bar; and say, in more than words, 'It is I, be not afraid; be not dismayed, for I am thy God. I am the Saviour, whom, though unseen, you loved—whom you thought upon in your bed, and remembered when you were waking. You confessed me, before a generation that disowned me. You were not ashamed of me, nor of my words, amidst a hostile and contemptuous world. And now I fulfil my promise. Now I confess you, before my Father, and the holy angels. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'

"But independently of these considerations, if the solemnities of the day of judgment were nothing more than splendid metaphor,—if there were no promises nor decrees, to render the salvation of God's elect as unchangeable as his truth, and as fixed as the pillars of his throne—the love of God would, by its own inherent energy, re-ascend to the source from whence it flows. That deathless principle would remain unmoved, amidst the storms which will one day shake this earth from her foundations. Amidst the groans of expiring nature, and the ruins of this material fabric, the celestial spark would rise to the life immortal. Love would spread its soft pinions, and soar aloft, through burning elements, and dissolving worlds; till it lighted on the topmost branch of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God; and there commenced its never-ending song of praise, to Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever."

Returning to England we find, among the numerous volumes of sermons on our table, the recent ones of Mr. Melvill, Mr. Bradley, and Mr. Blunt; we hoped, but our space forbids, to have at least tripled the list.

Mr. Melvill's last volume is, to our minds, the best which has issued from his eloquent pen. It abounds in striking thoughts, powerful arguments, felicitous illustrations, pungent appeals, and —using the word in its classical sense—highly sustained declamations; and though we do not admit every premise, or see our way to every conclusion, it would be our sin and grief if we had perused his volume without deriving from it much instruction and edification. It is less Melvinnian in its style than some of his former publications; but this we account no defect. A dull writer

at twenty becomes a tortoise at forty; but overwrought embellishment and ultra imaginative vivacity, can be moderated as the judgment ripens, without any undue sacrifice of the lively to the solid. Men must be kept awake; but there are more ways of keeping them awake than letting off sky-rockets.

But these are minor matters; we turn to the more profitable duty of selecting a few passages for the meditation of ourselves and our readers.

The first discourse is on Jacob's ladder. It appears to us too imaginative; but the speculative discussions are ancillary to such inestimable exhortations as the following:

"But now we address you, in conclusion, as beings confined for a while to a narrow and inconsiderable scene, but whose home is far away, in those regions of light where Deity is specially manifested, and where the angel and archangel have their abode. We point you to the everlasting hills, whose glorious and gold-lit summits come out to the eye of faith from the mighty expanse; and we tell you that those hills must be climbed. We point you to 'a city which hath foundations,' the 'Jerusalem which is above:' we show you its stupendous walls stretching interminably upward; and we tell you that these walls must be scaled. And you are staggered at the greatness of the demand. How can we ascend hills which are not based on this earth; how surmount walls, of which no eye can take the altitude? We lead you with us to Bethel, and bid you behold that on which the Patriarch gazed. There is a ladder, set up on the ground, but its top reaches to the summit of the mountain, and to the gate of the city. Are you willing to go up, to leave the prison, and to seek the palace? Then in the name of the living God, we bid you plant the foot on the first step of this ladder: forsake evil courses, break away from evil habits, and take part with the disciples of Christ. Christ casteth out none who come unto Him: and he who strives to turn from his iniquities at the call of his Saviour, is beginning to lay hold on that propitiation, through the grasping of which in its several parts he will be gradually raised to the blessedness of immortality. Are you afraid of trusting yourselves to this ladder? Thousands, in every age, have gone up by it to glory; and not a solitary individual has found it give way beneath him, however immense the burden of his sins. And why afraid? The ladder is He, who is 'able to save to the uttermost' all who would go unto God through Him; and the angels are ascending and descending upon it, for they have charge over the righteous to keep them in all their ways; and the Almighty himself looks down on those who are climbing painfully upwards, that He may send them succour, when the hand is relaxing, and the foot failing. I can answer for it, that every one of you may, if he will, mount by this ladder; seeing that Christ took human nature, and thus united earth and heaven, as the substitute of all. I can answer for it, that none, who strive to mount by this ladder, shall fail of everlasting life; for those who believe on Christ can never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of His hand. The canopy of the sky seems lined with the 'cloud of witnesses.' Those who have gone before are bidding us climb, through the one Mediator, to their lofty abode. We come, we come. Your call shall be obeyed. Your voices animate us, as they steal down in solemn and beautiful cadence. And, God helping, there shall not be one of us, who does not seek salvation through the blood and righteousness of Jesus; not one who shall not share with you the throne and the diadem."

There is a most excellent and instructive sermon upon Popery. The author does not coquette with Antichrist, as some recent writers have done in regard to its heretical subversion of the doctrine of justification by faith, which he places in the forefront of its transgressions. The following is the sum of his charges:

"We recur then to our former assertion, and declare that the Protestantism, for which we contend as irreconcileable with Popery, is nothing else but the Protestantism of Christ and his Apostles. And the Protestantism of Christ and his Apostles can have no peace with Popery. We would, if possible, 'live peaceably with all men,' and, therefore, with the Roman Church. But it is not possible. We cannot surrender justification by faith. We cannot multiply mediators. We cannot bow down before images. We cannot believe bread to be flesh, and wine to

be blood. We cannot ascribe to a fallible man the unerring wisdom of the one living God. And, therefore, it is not possible. No; if Popery regain its lost power, let it not be through our giving it the right hand of fellowship. Let it wrest back ecclesiastical endowments; let it rekindle the fires of persecution; let it be legislated into might by time-serving concessions; but never let us be silent, as though we thought Popery to be truth; never supine, as though we counted its errors unimportant."

The sermon on "The proportion of grace to trial" is sympathising, and full of consolation, and speaks powerfully to the spiritual understanding and deepest feelings of the Christian. The sermon on Heaven is a sublime and heart-stirring composition.

Mr. Bradley's sermons do not affect fervid eloquence or impassioned imaginings; but they are so scriptural, so solid, so lucid, so eminently calculated for practical utility, so beautifully chaste and classical in their style, that it is much to the honour of the readers of sermons, that they have been so extensively popular. We find some in the sixth, and others in the tenth edition; a few quotations, therefore, to exhibit the author's manner of writing would be superfluous, nor are such sermons duly appreciated by detached extracts.

Of Mr. Blunt's sermons we have often heard it asked, What is it that has caused them to be circulated in almost unprecedented numbers?—we have counted nearly a hundred editions of his publications!—and the answer has uniformly been, It is not abstractedly the sermons, but the preacher. They are remarkably simple and unpretending; there is no affectation of oratory or sentimentalism; they are earnest, scriptural, practical, and solidly useful; but their great charm is, that they were first delivered forcibly and unaffectedly by the lips of one who was spending and being spent in the service of his Divine Master, and of the souls committed to his charge; and who has been rescued from the brink of the grave to follow up in quieter sphere the laborious duties which he had unsparingly marked out in an overwhelming metropolitan district. Mr. Blunt's discourses, like Mr. Bradley's, cannot be fairly exhibited by detached passages, though if we had room we would gladly give a specimen.

OBITUARY.

THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS BURGESS, D.D., LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

(*Concluded from p.* 792.)

Bishop Burgess's studious and retiring habits induced a life of apparent seclusion from public affairs, and prevented him from taking any active part in the House of Peers; but his vote or proxy was never withheld, when any measure affecting the interests of religion or the Church called for the exercise of his Parliamentary privilege; and so strongly did he feel concerned in the defence of the Protestant establishment, whether in England or Ireland, that he was persuaded, more zealously perhaps than advisedly, to permit his name to be put forth as the Chaplain to the Grand Orange Association. "No peace with Rome," was his settled maxim; and in regard to the outcry of political or theological liberalism, about the harshness of the language of our Articles and Homilies respecting this our "dear sister," he said: "If the Church of Rome be idolatrous, there can be neither calumny nor absurdity in

calling her Anti-christian, or the Anti-christian power; for *nothing can be more Anti-christian than idolatry.*" When Mr. Wix published a proposal for a comprehension with the Church of Rome, the bishop replied to him, with equal zeal and power of argument; adding that he should be very glad to see a general union among Protestants, if that could be effected. His attachment to the principle of the Bible Society, and his conscientious and unwearied opposition to every measure for the removal of the disabilities of the Romanists, were connected with his full conviction that Popery is antichrist; and that God's holy word is the most powerful weapon with which to attack him.

The Bishop of Salisbury, we need scarcely remark, was firmly attached to the rites and formularies of the Anglican church. We have already noticed his observance of the too much neglected solemnity of the season of Lent. Hannah More writes, in 1809, "The good bishop of St. David's paid us a second visit. He drove over from Bath to breakfast, and as it was Easter Monday, he desired after breakfast to read the whole church service to us. It was so primitive and so like all he does, it pleased me. With guests and workfolks we mustered a decent congregation." Yet he was not so wedded to external forms as to substitute their letter for their spirit. The writer of these remarks was one day walking home with him, after service at a chapel in which there being a large number of communicants, the clergyman had administered the elements to several persons during one repetition of the blessing. The bishop remarked, that he had not been accustomed to it, and did not altogether like it; but he saw that there was no help for it; and necessity was a law.

Of the bishop's doctrinal opinions, we are not sure that we can give a very accurate delineation. That they were of a Protestant complexion, his anti-Romanist, and his Bible Society publications, with his sermons, charges, and speeches, abundantly prove; and we have already quoted his pregnant remark about not substituting good works for justification by faith, and also Dean Pearson's testimony as to his simple reliance alone upon the atonement of his Saviour for pardon and peace with God. Yet, though personally building upon the only true foundation, we are far from thinking that he had a clearly scriptural view of the true bearings and extent of the doctrine of justification by faith. His line of reading had been very much in the direction of such writers as Bishop Bull, and he rather practically outgrew their notions than theoretically disclaimed them. One who knew him well, and whom he highly esteemed, writes to us: "It is, I apprehend, true, that the Bishop did not understand theoretically the doctrine of justification by faith, as taught by St. Paul, and held by our Reformers. He thought that he did, and in one of his Charges, to which you can no doubt refer, argued the subject, and quoted both from the Homilies and from Hooker, in support of his view of it. I conversed frequently with him upon this important point, but could never perfectly succeed in convincing him of what I believe to be the truth of Scripture respecting it. Notwithstanding this speculative defect, he was, I doubt not, simple in his own dependence on the grace of God, and the merits of Christ, for acceptance and salvation."

Our present view of the Bishop's theology is coincident with that given by our predecessors in our earlier volumes. Thus in our volume for 1805, in the review of his Easter Catechism, published before he was a bishop, we read: "We should have considered this definition of faith in Christ more complete if it had intimated, with more explicitness, an apprehension of the merits of Christ as the ground of our justification. We must at the same time admit, that the renunciation of our own strength and righteousness, and our entire dependence upon Christ, are so distinctly and forcibly stated, that what we wish to have seen expressed is virtually implied..... The venerable author may be truly said to have made Christ all in all. Not only does he exalt his divinity as a person, but his efficiency as a Saviour; he makes the Redeemer everything in the kingdom of grace." In allusion to Mr. Burgess's recommendation of several works, among others those of Wilberforce, H. More, and Fenelon, for "their truly scriptural principles of *vital and spiritual religion*," it was remarked: "We shall be very much surprised if the prelate escape the haughty castigation of the Anti-Jacobin reviewers, for employing terms to which none but a Quaker or a Methodist, they say, can affix a meaning; and recommending what they have been pleased to style 'the senseless and unscriptural gibberish of Wilberforce.'"

We have penned these remarks as due to honest truth-loving biography; but we have a more recent statement from the pen of Archdeacon Lear, which we have great satisfaction in annexing.

"On the all-sufficient name of Him

who is our peace, who died to make peace, and who ever liveth to make intercession for us; through whom the guilty obtain pardon, the alien is brought nigh, and they that labour and are heavy-laden find rest, did he found his hope of peace. As justified by faith alone, and not for his own works or deservings, did he humbly hope he had peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Oh, how well do I remember some striking words of his on this very subject about three weeks before his death: they were among the last I heard him speak. 'I think,' said he, 'on looking back to my past life, I have acted for the most part conscientiously; but how unworthily and how shortly!'—Here tears interrupted his speech. 'Oh, what a comfort there is in looking to Christ! I scarcely like,' he added, 'to use that expression, common as it is, of looking to the cross; it is a *figurative* term, whereas I want something *substantial*. I had rather make mention of Him who died, than of the *instrument* by which he suffered. Can there be a doubt but that he who expressed himself, simply and sincerely, in language such as this, had the root of the matter in him? Must not the Lord have been keeping him in true peace, the peace which passeth understanding, who could thus humbly and entirely cast aside all self-righteousness, all self-dependence, and rest every comfort and every hope on his Saviour, and determine to know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified as his foundation?"

"During his illness in the last autumn, considering himself on a deathbed, he sent for a friend on whose Christian faithfulness he could rely, and said to him, 'I feel that in all probability I shall not long survive this attack; I wish, therefore, to be tried as to the foundation on which I am resting. Will you give me your view of the frame of mind, and the particular objects of faith and dependence, which a person thus situated ought to contemplate and cherish? What should be my views and feelings in the near prospect of an eternal world? When you have given me your sentiments, I will tell you my own.' His friend immediately held up the Saviour as the one and all-sufficient refuge, and dwelt on the simple promises made in the gospel to the penitent and believing, mentioning several passages of Scripture which he thought peculiarly suitable to the occasion. To these views the bishop cordially assented, expressed the strong consolation he had derived from such texts as that in 1 John i. 9—'If we confess our sins,' &c. &c.; and quoted several others, all bearing upon the mercy of God to the penitent believer in Christ Jesus. Surely these were the sentiments of one 'clothed with humility,' of one who, feeling his own wants and weakness, had received the kingdom of heaven as a little child, and had been made partaker of that grace which God giveth to the humble."

In 1835 the Bishop sank at the communion table at Warminster in the midst of the office of confirmation. He was then prevented by illness from holding his visitation, and published an address to his clergy, exhorting them to contend earnestly for the faith as handed down by the pure and apostolic church of England. He went from Salisbury to the milder air of Southampton, whither he had repaired more than once before, to recruit his health, and still to be as near as possible to his diocese, to perform all the duties of its superintendance. His bodily strength continued much as usual until two days before his decease, when it became apparent that the hand of death was on him. He was himself fully aware of it, and, in the full assurance of Christian faith, patiently waited for his passage to eternity. He was interred in Salisbury cathedral; the spot, situate in the south aisle of the choir, having been previously indicated by his Lordship.

We omitted to state, that in the year 1796, the Bishop (then Mr. Burgess) married Miss Bright, of Durham, half-sister of the Marchioness of Winchester. Mrs. Burgess survives his Lordship. They had no children.

The venerable poet, Canon Bowles, an author of more than fifty years' standing, and who still survives at an age prolonged far beyond the ordinary lot of man, favours us with the following memorandum, with which we close our desultory narrative:—

"Perhaps the Editor of the Christian Observer might think it worth mentioning, that in his 79th year the good Bishop occupied himself in adding some line, which he thought would suit the character of Ken's Morning Hymn. He gave them to me, but I know not where I laid them. The anecdote is curious, for our poor friend had never occupied his thoughts in metre; and I told him that such '*rhymes* as he had introduced, Non Dii, non homines, &c.' However he retained them somewhat modified, but was correcting a sheet of some critical and religious observations, like venerable Bede, on the very day of, or the day before, his death, in bed; and when his end evidently approached, his last wish was expressed to be bu-

ried in the Cathedral, next to the relations of Bishop Ken, whose verses he imitated. He was accordingly laid in his last rest, 'with chants of service clear;' the very next grave to William Hawkins—great nephew to Ken, and who wrote his life. William Hawkins's daughter lies near—and his beloved nephew—Ken's nephew—Canon Walton, son of Isaac Walton Piscator. William Hawkins was only son of Dr. Hawkins, Prebendary of Winchester, who married *Isaac Walton's daughter* by the *sister* of Ken. I have written hastily, but can assure you of the fact respecting our poor Bishop's dying swan-like melody, if you think it worth noticing."

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

We said last month that we did not think there was much to regret in the breaking up of the Durham autocratship, under such advisership as that of Mr. Wakefield and Mr. Turton; but we still less lament it since the appearance of his Lordship's most unadvised, unstatesmanlike, and, we must add, pettish, egotistical, reckless, and despotic proclamation. The document is, however, highly valuable as an exhibition of his Lordship's temper and opinions, on the ground that he is gravely proposed as the leader of the Radical party in parliament during the next session; Lord Brougham being too wayward for the purpose, and no member of the House of Commons having sufficient weight.

We regret that we have no room left to comment upon two matters which we had intended to notice in significant juxta-position:—the proposed opening of the London Post-office on the Lord's-day—a sin and evil so great that the most prompt and vigorous efforts ought to be made to prevent it—and the formation, by "Evangelical Dissenters," of the "Religious Equality Society." This society is founded upon the fundamental principle of the French revolutionary philosophists, that though individuals have a right to worship their Creator and Redeemer as they please, yet legislatures, governments, and nations, ought to be atheistical. Hence the national observance of the Lord's-day as a religious institution ought to be discarded; and if the opening of the Post-office is considered by the government to be a civil benefit, it is to be opened; for "Dissenters upon principle" affirm, that it is persecution to legislate for Christian purposes; the honour of God, his word, his command, and the spiritual interests of mankind, are not to be named in the national counsels. This very month last year (page 852—854,) in reply to a Dissenter who did not seem to understand the principles of his leaders, we shewed that there is no "religious equality" reason why the Post-office, or any other office, or the courts of justice, or the British Museum, should not be open upon Sunday as much as Saturday; and we have again and again, but in vain, asked Dr. Smith, Dr. Binney, Dr. Burder, Mr. Burnett, Mr. J. Clayton, and we now add the whole "Religious Equality" committee, to shew us why we are nationally to recognize the Christian's Sunday any more than the Jews' Saturday. It is a melancholy spectacle to see men who profess to follow the Bible, aping the infidel antics of the French revolutionists. Whatever may be their private doctrines, we ask, where, as citizens, they stop short of Voltaire?

We have much satisfaction in concluding our volume (which, as Christian Observers, appropriately ends with the ecclesiastical year) with following up the Rev. J. H. Stewart's annual exhortation to united prayer on New Year's-day, for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the universal church.

There is one statement in Mr. Stewart's circular, which gladdens our hearts amidst all the strifes and evils of the day. He says: "I can, with the greatest truth, affirm that I know not any one year in which there has appeared so much spiritual life, and so much active zeal and diligence in the Lord's cause, as in the present." We believe it; and again we thank God, and take courage.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. K.; VIGIL; W. G. G.; A GENTILE ISRAELITE; J. H.; R. S.; J. E. P.; A CLERGYMAN in a FAR COUNTRY; W. C.: Δ.; Πιστις; M. S.; F. S.; Sigma; M. B.; J. B.; A. CONSTANT READER; J. B. M.; G. A. J.; are under consideration.

The translations from the Fathers, now publishing, are not the Newman and Pusey series.

INDEX

OF THE

ESSAYS, SUBJECTS, INTELLIGENCE, OCCURRENCES,

&c. &c. &c.

page

AFFLICTION, Sanctifying Influence of 145, 209, 546
Aix-la-Chapelle, Relics at 23
Altars, Bowing to 113
Anecdotes of Washington 38
Apologies for Indolence 556
Antichrist, Whether a Person..... 232
——— Whether the Pope 288
Apostolical Succession .. 85, 292, 630, 644, 649, 819
Atonement, The 652
Articles, The, whether Calvinistic.. 390, 627
Ascension of our Lord..... 337

Balaam, The History of.....295, 350
Balls, Reasons for not attending .. 222
Baptism, On Justification in .. 52, 123, 258, 396, 488, 625, 651
——— Immersion 809
——— Nature and Effects of .. 123, 755, 808
——— Regeneration in..434, 526, 570
Baptists, Conduct of the 622
Barley Wood, H. More's Removal from 357
Beer Shops..... 535
Believing, Joy in 279
Bible, English version defended 697, 758
Breviary, The 710, 743
Burning Sacramental Elements . . 37, 240

Calvinism.....390, 435, 493
Canadas, Disturbances in..69, 205, 599, 727
Christ, Ascension of 337
——— Temptation of.. ..... 409, 473
——— Offices of 417
Christian Observer .. 72, 109, 165, 233, 509
Christianity, Leading Object of 155
——— Affected Reverence for 516
——— Aspects of 608
Church Spoliation..... 32
——— What constitutes a true .. 292
(*See Apostolical Succession*)
——— of England Defended ..250, 336, 408, 431, 465, 641, 653, 715
——— Revival in the 725
——— Increasing Efficacy of..... 763
Churches, Notices in, Abolished .. 69
——— Inscriptions in..... 564
——— Office for Consecrating .. 18

page

Cologne, Archbishop of 23
Colonization, Remarks on 133
Common Sense..... 609
Confessional, The .. 154, 677, 704, 818
Confirmation..... 686
Consecration of Churches 18
——— Forms of..... 19
Conservation 724
Conversion of Dr. Johnson..... 81
Coronation 408, 469, 472, 536
——— Service 322
——— Tract on the..... 559
Councils, On the First Four 43
Credulity of Religious Persons 620
Creeds, The Three 48
Criminal Laws Ameliorated 728

Deacon's Stole 175, 246
Debtors, On Imprisoning 728
Dead, Praying for the 616
Death-Bed (*See Obituary*)
——— of H. More 307
——— of A. Knox..... 376
——— of Sarah More 423
Degrading a Priest 187
Dissenters, Remarks on the Principles and Conduct of .. 8, 89, 219, 432, 623, 701, 754
——— Confirming 566
Doing Good 547
Dublin Review 821
Duelling 664

East, On Turning to the 179
Ecclesiastical Statistics 692
Eclectic Review 9, 507, 663
Education of the People (*See National Education*)
——— Objects of..... 387
Election, Melancthon's View of.... 562
——— to Baptism 564
End of all Things 1
English Bible Vindicated 697, 758
Ephesus, Tumult at 670
Episcopacy, Arguments for 96
——— in United States .. 32, 634
——— in Scotland 444
——— Hooker on 614
Exaggeration, Evils of 99
Extempore Preaching 21, 161, 231

Family Instruction 633

page
Farewell Discourse of our Lord 793
Father of Lights 537
Fathers (*See Tradition*)
——— Doctrines of the .. 53, 102, 123, 186, 632
——— their Allegorisings 218
Fiction, Works of 106
Fine Arts 336

Gloucester Music Meeting 566

Hearing and Doing the Word..... 729
Hewley (Lady) Trusts 15, 71
Hippodrome at Notting Hill 334
Homilies, Typographical Error in .. 184
Humour 425
Hymn, Remarks on a.....349, 450
Hymns, Impassioned 428

Inconsideration 73
India, On Participating in the Idolatry of 114, 271, 408, 471
Infallibility of the Church.....313
Ireland, Condition of 363, 407
Irish Tithe Act 272, 536, 600
—— Poor Law 535

Jews, On the Restoration of the .. 286, 443, 518, 554, 665
Justification, The Doctrine of .. 51, 121, 257, 303, 396, 497
Lessons, On Laymen reading the .. 82, 158, 228, 252, 423
Letter from J. P. Smith 8
London University College 248
Loo-Choo, Voyage to 688
Lord's Day, On the Observance of the .. 69, 206, 214, 270, 334, 408, 470, 524, 664
Lord's Supper, Mode of Administering..... 173
——— ——— not a Sacrifice..218, 233, 250
——— after Confirmation .. 686
Love of God, its Blessedness 273

Marriage Act 511
Mass, The, a Bloody Sacrifice 237
Memoir (*See Obituary*)
——— of F. Preston 56
——— of T. Babington 127
——— of Bp. Hall ..354, 418, 479, 542
——— of W. Wilberforce 403, 567, 773
——— of Bp. White 634
Miracles, La Place's Argument against 617
Moral Parrallels.....551, 611
Moravian Mission to South Africa 735, 799
"Most Religious," on the Phrase .. 673

National Churches Defended.. 336, 408, 433, 653, 701
——— Education ..206, 267, 378, 680
New Zealand Colinization.. 70, 131, 471
November-Five Service 168

page
Obituary (*See Memoir*)
——— of Bp. Burgess 64, 784, 835
——— of Mrs. Corrie 140
——— Dr. Marshman 465, 467
——— Rev. T. Biddulph 594
Oblations, Meaning of the Term .. 185
Ordination Questions 388, 485, 624
Orphan School 11
Oxford, Antiquities at 354
——— Innovations at 71, 108, 164
——— Tracts 31, 53, 72, 112, 123, 259, 393, 405, 497, 614, 642, 820
——— ——— Stealthiness of the.. 171, 710, 743

Parliament, Proceedings in .. 68, 206, 270, 334, 469, 534
Patronage 773
Paul, St., Preaching in England.... 65
Pentateuch..... 347
Plurality Bill 272, 470, 535
Poetry—Hope—Idle Reading—Perfect World—Frail Bark —Faith 49
Parting — Transfiguration—Alabaster-Box—Durable Riches 119
Hymns of the Primitive Church—Pozzuoli 255
Flowers—Anemone—Preach the Gospel 309
French Lines —Latin Epitaph —Restless Night—The Angels..... 430
Harvest—Christ our Father —Boyhood— Pavilion—Three Sons 521
Babe of Bethlehem..... 761
Poetry, Religious, Thoughts on 34, 114
Portable Communion Apparatus .. 682
Prayer 5
Prayer-book, Mutilated Edition of the 221
Preaching Extempore 21, 161, 231
——— Remarks on 450
Presbyterians, Doctrines of the .. 15, 84
Pronunciation of Names 444
Prophetic Days 287
Prothesis, Table of..... 183, 229, 235
Providence, Illustrations of..... 810
Public Affairs....68, 143, 205, 270, 405, 469, 534, 599, 664, 723
Pulpit Jurisdiction 375

Quakers, refusing Tithes 442

Reaction, Dangers of 99, 760
Regeneration, Essay on..... 601
Relics, Worship of 23
Relinquished Missions..... 735, 799
Reporting Speeches of Societies.... 335
Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge 651
Ripon Ordination Questions .. 388, 485, 624
Roman Catholic Statutes 149

page
Romanism, Superstition of 23, 240
Romanist Confessional .. 154, 677, 704
——— Church Furniture 236
——— Use of Oxford Tracts 616, 821

Sabbath (*See Lord's Day*)
Sacramental Justification .. 52, 258, 488, 625
Scotland, Church of 85, 643
——— Episcopal Church in 444
Scripture, On the Comprehensive Study of .. 224, 282, 334
——— Supremacy of ..... 313, 646 (*See Tradition*)
——— not Scientific 700
——— Names 444
Sermons, Style of 452
Ships, On Christening 517
Slavery, Abolition of .. 189, 272, 408, 471, 524, 599, 727
Sobriety 2
Society, British and Foreign Bible 323, 543
——— of Literature 742
——— National School 383, 681
——— for promoting Chtn. Knowledge .. 90, 208, 215, 218, 323, 335, 438, 622
——— Prayer-Book and Homily 18, 101, 322
——— Church Missionary 408,
——— Pastoral Aid 408, 768
——— Tract 559
——— Christian Influence 656
Spontaneous Production 58, 804, 809
Superstition 31, 37, 166

Teaching, Art of 42
Temperance Societies 611
Temptation of our Lord 409, 473
Time, Reflections on 1
Times, Tracts for the (*See Oxford Tracts*)
Tracts, Injudicious Anecdotes in .. 752
——— Sectarian Omissions in .. 520, 522, 559, 629
——— Oxford (*See Oxford*)
——— of the Anglican Fathers 720
Tradition .. 44, 53, 102, 123, 246, 263, 311, 622, 644

Unions (exceptionable ones,) 11
United States, Episcopal Church in 32, 634
——— Voluntaryism in 304
Unity, Tract on 628

Virgin Mary, on Homage to the 644, 744
Vital Principle 58
Voluntaryism 685, 701
——— Statistics of 692
——— in United States 304

Waldenses, Apostolical Succession among the 630
Watchfulness 3
Welsh Bibles 323
West Indies .. 189, 272, 408, 471, 524, 599, 727
Will, Swift's 688
Wills Act 68
Wise Men's Offering 704
Words, Use of 42
Worldly Habits 106, 631

Zoolu Massacre 471

INDEX TO THE REVIEWS.

page
Acworth's Sermon on Babington .. 127

Babington, Acworth's Sermon on .. 127
Blomfield, Bp., on National Education 266, 378
Blunt's, Rev. H., Sermons 828
Bowen's, Bp., Sermon for Bp. White 634
Bradley's, Rev. C., Sermons 828
Burgess, Rev. R., on National Education 266, 378

Collects and Catechisms 322
Central Society, Publications of, 266, 378
Chalmers's, Rev. Dr., on National Churches 653
Christian Influence Society's Report 653
Churches, Form of Consecrating .. 322
Coates, D., on New Zealand Association 131
Cobweb's to Catch Calvinists, by a Clergyman 388
Coronation Service 322

Essays on the Church, by a Layman 640

page
Faber, Rev. G. S., on Justification, 51, 121, 257

Hare's, the Rev. A. W., Sermons 452, 525
Harvey's Visit to Antigua 189
Heber's, Bp., Sermons 828

Jackson's, the Rev. Miles, Oxford Tracts Unmasked 388
Journal of a Visit to Antigua, &c., by J. Sturge and T. Harvey .....
Justification, Rev. G. S. Faber on, 51, 121, 257

Laurence, Archbp., on Baptism .. 388
Layman's Essays on the Church .. 640
Lectures on National Churches, by the Rev. Dr. Chalmers 653
Letter on New Zealand Association, by D. Coates 131
——— by E. G. Wakefield 131
Life of W. Wilberforce, by the Rev. R. T. and S. Wilberforce 403, 567

page
Matthias's Sermons..... 828
Melvill's, Rev. H., Sermon on Religious Education 266
——— Sermons.. 828
Murray on the Vital Principle 58

National Education, Sermon on, by Bishop Blomfield..... 266, 378
———————, Rev. R. Burgess on 266, 378
Newman's, Rev. J. H., Lectures on Romanism..... 310
New Zealand Association, Objects of 131
———————, D. Coates on 131
———————, Wakefield on 131
———————, British Colonization in, by New Zealand Association 131
Nicholson's Call upon the Church 653, 763

Oxford Tracts Unmasked, by the Rev. Miles Jackson..... 388

Prayer-book and Homily Society .. 322
Prayers from the Liturgy 322
Preston, Rev. M. M., on Scriptural Instruction 55

Roberts's "Call upon the Church" 653, 763
Religious Education, the Rev. H. Melvill's Sermon on..... 266
Report of Committee of Commons on Education 266
Romanism and Protestantism, by the Rev. J. H. Newman 310

Schools for the Industrious Classes, by Central Society 266
Scriptural Instruction, by the Rev. M. M. Preston..... 55
Sermon, the Rev. W. Acworth's, for Babington 127
———, by Bishop Blomfield, on National Education 266
———, by the Rev. H. Melvill, on Religious Education 266
———, by Bishop Bowen for Bp. White..... 634
Sermons, by the Rev. A. W. Hare, 452, 525
——— Matthias's 828
——— Bishop Heber's 828
——— Melvill's 828
——— Woodward's 828
——— Bishop Wilson's 828
——— Rev. H. Blunt's 828
——— Rev. C. Bradley's 828
Sturge's Visit to Antigua..... 189

The Call upon the Church, by W. Roberts, Esq., and the Rev. W. Nicholson 653
The Doctrine of Baptism, by Archbishop Laurence 388
"The Parochial System," by the Rev. H. Wilberforce 653

Vital Principle, Murray on..... 58

Wakefield, E. G., on New Zealand Association 131
West Indies in 1837, by J. Sturge and T. Hervey 189
Wilberforce's Life, by his Sons, 403, 567, 774
———, Rev. H., Parochial System 658, 763
Wilson's, Bishop, Sermons..... 858
Woodward's Sermons 858
Works on National Education .. 266, 378
——— the National Church Establishment 653

INDEX TO PRINCIPAL NAMES.

page
Acland, Sir T. 407
Ackworth 127
Addison 554
Agnew, Sir A... 69, 270, 534, 535
Ainslie 693, 694, 695
Ambrose ..103, 125, 484, 648
Antoine de Chandieu 451
Aquinas, T..... 54
Arundel, Abp... 177, 178
Ashley, Lord 535
Athanasius 103, 125, 219, 632, 648
Atterbury, Bp. 245
Augustine.. 103, 125, 242

Babbage 620
Babington 127, 393
Baines 488
Bancroft, A bp. 86
Baring, Rev. G. 441
Barrington, Bp... 67, 569
Basil..103, 104, 125, 483, 484, 648, 409
Bathurst, Arch. 11
——— Lord 203
Baxter, Rev. R. 142, 423
Beaumont 193
Bedell, Bp..... 64, 546
Beecham 208
Bellarmine, Card. .. 110
Benedict XIV..... 153
Bennett, Dr. 434, 697
Benson..... 655
Bernard of Clairvaux 125, 219, 220
Bethel, Bp. 435
Bexley, Lord .. 623, 809
Bickersteth 224, 282, 344, 345
Biddulph ... 398, 435, 594
Bingham 166
Binney .. 433, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707
Blake, Rt. Hon., N.A. 382
Blaney, Dr. 697
Blomefield, Mr...422, 481
Blomfield, Bp...206, 208, 266, 272, 378, 471, 536
Blunt, Rev. H. 858
Bona, Card..... 253
Boone 96
Bowen, Bp. 634
Bowles, Canon ..71, 208, 428, 429, 430
Bradford, Bp. .. 328, 434
Bradley..... 545
Brougham, Lord 205, 206, 207, 269, 378, 382, 470, 553, 727
Brown, Rev. D. 141, 142
Bucer 181, 507

page
Bull, Bp. 650
Bulwer 107
Bunyan..... 157
Buonaparte 689
Burgess, Bp. 64, 112, 208, 784
——Rev. R. 66, 206, 266, 378, 472
Burke 23, 190, 479
Burkett..... 482
Burn, Dr..... 43
Burnet, Bp. ..45, 46, 48, 51, 86, 100, 102, 160, 163, 229, 398, 488, 491, 824
Burnett, Dr..... 434
Burton 66, 563
Butler 155
——— Bp. 292, 586
Byron, Lord 107, 114

Calvin .. 91, 95, 97, 122, 124, 181, 494, 501, 505, 562, 588
Camden, Lord..... 584
Canning 191, 711
Carey, Dr. 405, 467, 468, 469
Carleton, Bp. 95
Carlisle 155
Carrick, Dr..... 360
Cartwright 159, 160
Castlereagh, Lord .. 664
Catton 616
Chalmers, A..... 81, 481
——— Dr...85, 90, 91, 336, 378, 408, 433, 620, 653, 701, 702, 705, 706, 707
Chambers..... 382
Chandler, Rev. J. .. 254
Channing, Dr..... 709
Charlemagne..28, 29, 508
Charles I. 95, 104
——— II. 95, 182
Charlotte Elizabeth .. 225
Chase, Bp. 66
Cheyne, Dr. 377
Chillingworth 647
Chrysostom 103, 125
Clark..... 197, 407
Clarke, Arch. 19
Clarke, R. 335, 336
Clarkson 777
Clemens Alexandrinus 97, 125
——— Romanus.. 97, 125, 126
Clift 61
Coates, D. 70, 131
Cobbett 610
Cobham, Lord..... 187
Coddington 165, 166
Coleridge 71, 208
——— Bp. .. 201, 202
Collingridge 616
Collins 662
Cologne, Abp. 23

page
Colquhoun 206, 407, 441
Combe, Dr. A. 382
Connor, Capt..... 197
Cooke 806
Cooper, A. 118, 363
Corrie, Bp. 140, 141, 142, 143, 144
——— Mrs. 140
Cosins, Bp. 174
Cotterill 141
Cottle 71, 357, 358
Coustier, M..... 580
Coverdale..... 224
Cowper 585
Cox, Dr.....434, 697
Cranmer, Abp. 86, 92, 93, 94, 105, 122, 215, 242, 507, 562, 650, 720, 721, 722
Crawford 724
Crosse .. 58, 63, 804, 810
Crossman..... 682
Cumming 84, 614
Cunningham, Rev. J. 326
Curtis 697, 698, 758
Cyprian 103, 125, 253, 632
Cyril..... 125, 632

Davenant, Bp..... 95
Daubeny, Arch. 184, 185, 435
Dawes 66, 67
Dealtry, Dr..... 653
De Laune, Dr..... 86
Denman, Lord..... 143
Dens..151, 152, 153, 155, 679
Dido 133
Dillon, Capt. 198
Dominic 508
Diognetus..... 125
Doddridge 429, 588
Dodgson .. 472, 485, 562, 600, 624, 625
Dodsworth .. 93, 94, 167, 184, 288, 289, 292, 397, 505
Dodwell 100
Doyle, Dr...149, 150, 155
D'Oyley, Dr. 93
Du Moulin 244
Duppa 206
Duranders 48
Durham, Lord...134, 143, 726
Dwight 804, 809

East 595, 598
Easthope 271
Echard 219
Edward VI...95, 104, 105, 113, 165, 167, 174, 175, 176, 177, 181
Eldon, Earl of .. 203, 249
Eliot, Arch. 199
———Mr. 580
Elizabeth, Queen ..43, 95, 104, 105, 113, 177, 181, 676

page
Elliotson, Dr. 249
Faber ..51, 121, 238, 239, 257, 443, 562, 628, 629, 630
Farish, Prof. 64
Farraday 61
Firmin 10
Fordyce, Dr. 81
Foster, Dr. 62
Fox, C. J. Hon. 581
Foxe 225, 259, 354
Francis, St. 484
Frederick of Saxony 675
Frere..... 233
Froude .. 506, 507, 588, 643, 644, 719
Frowd, Miss 359

Gallus 253
Gathercole 144, 509
Gardiner, Capt. 471
——— Col..... 210
——— Bp..... 259
Garrard..... 214
Garson 48
Gaskin, Dr..... 323, 324
George III. 203, 591
Gibson, Bp. 43
Gisborne 573
Glenelg, Lord ..131, 133, 135, 136, 140, 204, 205, 727
Goldsmith, Dr. 516
Gordon, Dr..... 85
Grafton..... 84
Graham, Maria 141
———Sir J. 144
Grant, Mr. 128
——— Sir R. .....
Gregory I. 219
——— IX. 150
———Nazianzen 483, 484
——— XVI. 32
Gresley..... 23
Guion, Mde..... 429
Gurnall..... 482
Gurney, Rev. J.H. .. 521
——— J. J. 523
Gutzlaff..... 690, 692

Hall, Bp. .. 95, 355, 356, 418, 479, 542, 701, 702
—— Mrs. 481
—— R. .. 481, 482, 706, 707, 709, 710
—— Capt. B..... 689
Hamilton 88
Hare 452, 470, 525
Hartford 64
Harvey 189
Hastings, Lord ... 468
Hawks, Dr. 34
Heber, Bp. 219, 220, 431, 434, 453, 467
Henderson, Dr. 697
Henley, Lord 15
Henry, M. 180, 520, 521, 559, 701

page
Herbert, G. 244
Hermogenes 102, 632
Hewley, Lady..15, 84, 85
Heylin, Dr. 185, 216
Hickes, Dr. G. 94
Hinton 9, 432, 434, 507, 623, 624
Hobart, Bp. 66
Hodgson, Arch. 653
Honorius III..... 150
Hook, Dr. ..38, 112, 167, 169, 240, 320, 396, 402, 505, 507, 676
Hooker 86, 87, 95, 96, 159, 160, 317, 400, 402, 564, 614, 719
Hoppus, Dr. .. 248, 249, 387
Hornby .. 122, 123, 263, 376, 377
Horne, Rev. T. H.. 536
Horsley, Bp.265,321, 390, 439, 493, 494, 709
Howard 196
Howells 670
Howick, Lord..... 536
Howley, Abp. 91, 92, 93, 94, 113, 114, 208, 272, 354, 535
Hume, J. 70
——— D....112, 516, 553, 617, 620, 621
Humphrys, Bp. ... 94
Hyppolytus 103

Ignatius 97, 125, 126
Inglis, Sir H. 70, 453, 512
Innocent III. 508
Irenæus 97, 102, 125
Ives, Bp. 305
—— Rev. C. 453

Jackson 255
———, Miles 388
James I. 86, 95, 104, 106, 113, 181
——— II. .. 94, 95, 168
Jebb, Bp. .. 263, 395, 726
Jeffreys, Arch .. 554, 613
Jerome, St. 97, 103, 125, 219, 615
Jewell, Bp. 124, 439, 481, 507
" John Search " 703, 704, 705, 707
Johnson, Dr. 34, 81, 251, 322, 355, 697
Jones, Sir W..... 65, 249
Jones 23, 482
Jowett, Dr. 405
Julian 253
Justin Martyr .. 125, 253
Juxon, Bp. 215, 216

Keble .. 51, 72, 94, 109, 218, 246, 429, 430, 505, 507, 564
page
Kelly,.....303, 376, 377
Ken, Bp. ...30, 157, 167, 428, 481, 701, 711, 713
Kennicott, Mrs. 427
Kidd, Prof. 249
King, Bp..... 66
———Mr. 689
Kingston 240
Knox, Gen. 39
———Mr. .. 51, 54, 55, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 258, 263, 266, 303, 376, 377, 400, 651, 715, 716, 717, 718
Knox, Rev. J..... 88, 246

La Lande..... 60
Lamark..... 60
Langdale 488
Laplace 60, 617
Latimer, Bp.....242, 354
Latrobe, Rev. J. A. 255
——————— P..... 255
Laud, Abp. 18, 30, 69, 91, 92, 94, 100, 112, 113, 114, 171, 172, 183, 185, 214, 215, 216, 418, 505, 650, 702, 713
Lauderdale, Duke of 91
Laurence, Abp. 388, 435, 493, 501, 563, 564
Laurence, J..... 197
Law, Rev. W..... 222
—— Bp. 500
Lawson..... 215
Leader..... 70
Lear, Arch..... 65, 789
Le Bas 215, 216
Lee, Prof. 675
Leo III. 29
Leslie 93, 650
Leydon, Dr 468
Lightfoot, Dr. 253
Lindsey..... 585
Linsell 185
Livy 133
Lloyd, Bp. 94
——— Dr. 196, 481
Locke..... 60, 387
Lombard 54
Longley, Bp. .. 388, 489, 495, 500, 502, 506, 563, 626
Lonsdale 62
Luther..52, 53, 122, 124, 187, 507, 513, 562, 563, 649 675, 676
Lyndhurst, Lord.... 15

Macaulay.. 377, 392, 404, 405, 651, 777, 783
Maceroni 62
M'Crie, Dr..... 246
M'Ghee.....144, 155
M'Guire 38
M'Hale, Dr. 249, 515
M'Ilvaine, Bp..... 304
page
Madison, Bp. 634
Magee, Abp. .. 150,372
Maitland, Rev. S. .. 288, 292
——— Sir P..... 408
Malden, Prof. .. 382, 472
Manning 10
Mant, Bp. 391, 435, 439, 440, 441
Mary I., Queen.. 44, 181
Marsh, Bp. 326, 390. 489, 499, 627
Marshman, Dr...405, 467
Martyn, Rev. H. 141, 468
Marvell, A. 502
Mason, Dr. 40
Matthias 453
Maurice 72, 109, 170, 174
Melancthon 562, 649
Melbourne, Lord .. 470, 489, 600, 727
Melvill, Rev. H. .. 186, 206, 241, 242, 266, 674
Melville, Lord .. 190 181
———A..... 88
Mendham..... 238
Miller, Dr. .....
Milner, Dean .. 573, 578, 585, 594
——— Bp. 317, 318, 319, 320
——— Rev. J. .. 55, 122, 123, 292, 405, 578
Milton 250, 355, 387
Mirfin 664
Molesworth, Sir W. 134
Monk, Bp. 566
Moore, Judge 371
More, Sir T. 82, 160
—— H... 128, 307, 357, 386, 392, 405, 423, 590, 592
—— S. 423
—— M. 423, 591
Moultrie 524
Mulgrave, Lord 204
Murphy 9, 433
Murray, Dr. 58, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154
——— Sir G..... 194

Newman..37, 44, 51, 52, 72, 94, 102, 109, 110, 111, 144, 167, 170, 171, 172, 179, 184, 185, 220, 246, 260, 262, 310, 395, 502, 505, 507, 588, 647, 652, 653, 713, 718, 719
Newton, Rev. J. 573, 587, 665
Nichol, Dr. 245
Nicholl, Sir J..... 373
Nichols.....67, 715
Nicholson..... 653
Nixon 372
Noel, Hon. and Rev. B. W... 155, 207, 628, 726

page
Nolan 741
Norfolk, Duke of 82, 160

O'Callaghan, Sir R.. 144
O'Connell .. 9, 70, 154, 408, 433, 470, 623, 664, 724
Ollivant 788
Onderdonk, Bp. 304
Optatus 103
Origen 97, 125, 648
O'Sullivan 149
Overton 184
Overal, Bp. 86
Owen, Mr. 61, 471
——— Dr. ..94, 157, 399
——— Rev. J. 324

Paley, Arch. .. 552, 553, 618
Palmer 84, 158, 177
——— Dr. 197
Papineau 70
Parker, Abp. 479
Parr, Dr. 310
Pearson 547
Peel, Sir R. .. 408, 469, 470, 534, 600, 610
Pepys, Sir W. 425
Perceval, Hon. & Rev. A. 91
Perron 104
Peter Martyr 507
Phelan 149
Phillimore, Dr. 373
Philomena, St. 31
Phillpot, Bp. 407
Pickard 11
Pillans, Prof. 382
Pitt, Hon. W...572, 573, 575, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 586, 589, 594, 599, 664
Pius IV. 88, 151
Plumptre .. 69, 206, 270, 271, 408, 470, 534
Polycarp 125, 126
Porter 23
Porteus, Bp. 568
Potts 39
Poynder .. 144, 271, 272, 535
Preston 55
Priestley, Dr. 702
Prynne .. 112, 113, 185
Pusey, Dr. .. 51, 71, 72, 94, 108, 164, 187, 229, 230, 233, 260, 504, 505, 507, 588, 651, 710, 714, 717, 718, 719, 723

Raikes, Chancellor .. 653
Rawlinson 197
Reilly 155
Rich 407
Richmond, L. ..393, 622, 650
Ridley, Bp. .. 105, 239, 354, 507
Rillock 88
Roberts, W. .. 307, 357, 358, 359, 423, 425, 653
Rollin 133
Roper 82
Ross, Sir J. 137
Rowe, Mrs. 429, 430
Rufin 46
Russell 44
——— Lord J...70, 143, 249, 272, 381, 470, 471, 488, 513, 536
Ryder, Bp. 169
Ryland, Dr. 407, 467
Sacheverell .. 94, 168, 245

St. Hillaire 60
St. Vincent 60
Sancroft, Abp. .. 92, 93
Sandys, Abp. .. 86, 676
Sautre 187
Schmidt 735, 799
Scholefield, Prof. 653
Scoble 196
Scott, Rev. T. .. 96, 241, 392, 398, 405, 520, 555
Scott, Rev. J. ..377, 391, 434
——— Sir W. 107
Scougal 222
Seabury, Bp. 634
Secker, Abp. 92, 93
Seeley 325
Seneca 482
Senior 197, 198
Serle 142
Sharpe, G. 405
Shepherd .. 84, 158, 715
Short, Dr. 90, 563
Sidmouth, Lord .. 67, 203
Simeon .. 64, 178, 325, 326, 393, 594, 596
Simpson .. 206, 381, 472
Sligo, Marquis of .. 193, 197, 204, 272
Smith, J. P. .. 8, 71, 84, 85, 89, 295, 350, 433, 507, 600
Smith, Rev. S. ..11, 446, 489
——— E. 141
——— Sir L..197, 198, 204
Southey 24, 187
Sozomen 258
Spangenberg, Bp. .. 255
Sparrow, Bp. 48
Spencer, Hon. and Rev. 98, 182
Spottiswood 88
Spring Rice 217
Stillingfleet, Bp. 48
——— Mr. 585
Strafford, Earl of .. 214
Strype 86, 676
Sturge 189
Sumner, Bp. S. R...101, 466
Swedenboro', E.... 232
Swift, Dean 688

Talfourd, Sergt. 107
Talleyrand, Prince.. 386, 408, 679, 680, 818
Tandy 595
Taylor, Bp. 104, 219
Teignmouth, Lord .. 65, 324
Tennison, Abp. .. 92, 93
Tertullian ..97, 102, 126, 253, 648, 709
Thellusson, P. 580
Theodoret 96
Theophilus 103
Theophylact 185
Thomas, Dr. 94
Thomson 197
Thornton ..128, 129, 323, 393, 405, 577, 587
Thorp, Arch. 598
Thorpe 187
Tierney 582, 664
Tillotson, Abp... 86, 92, 93, 578, 588
Tomline, Bp. 96, 392, 625
Toplady 246
Townsend, Preb. 71, 72, 108, 109, 110, 112, 164, 165, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 177, 183, 711, 710, 712
Trollope, Rev. Mr... 183
Trumbull 41
Turner 725
Turton, Dean 697
——— Mr. 726
Tyndal 218, 233, 622
Tyrwhite 67, 68

Unwin 585

Van Mildert, Bp. .. 453
Vaughan, Dr. .. 233, 248, 250, 251, 222, 431, 433, 434
Venn, Rev. J. 405
——— Jun. .. 566
Victoria, Queen .. 68, 69, 133, 143, 334, 472, 536, 664, 673, 728
Vincentius Lyrinensis 103, 125
Virgil 133

Wake, Abp. 92, 93
Wakefield, E. G. 71, 131 727
Wakley 272
Walmsley, Dr. 579
Walpole, Sir R. 502
Ward 405
Washington, Gen. ... 38
——— ——— Mrs. .. 39
Watts, Dr...48, 251, 429, 545
Weare 595
Weaver 82
Wellesley, Lord 466

page
Wellington, Duke of .. 194, 207, 216, 407, 664
Wesley 392, 429, 496
——— C. 429
Whateley, Abp. 155, 687,
Wheatley .. 84, 158, 167, 173, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 245, 247
White, Bp. 92, 634
——— Rev. W. 136, 137, 139
Whitefoot..... 481
Whitefield.....496, 579
Whitgift, Abp. 86
Whittingham, Dean.. 86
Whitty, Arch. .. 118, 372, 374
Wickliffe 249
Wilberforce, W. .. 128, 129, 130, 203, 325, 361, 362, 392, 405, 425, 545, 567, 664, 774
Wilberforce, Rev. R. 403, 567
——— Rev. S. 403, 567
——— Rev. H. 653
William III. 168
——— IV. 68, 203, 728
Williams 139
——— James .. 196, 197, 198
Wilmot, Sir E..... 408
Wilson, Bp. D. .. 101, 453, 609, 611, 701
Wilson, Bp. T. .. 241, 242, 244
Winchelsea, Lord .. 664
Winram 89
Wiseman, Dr... 382, 504, 711, 715, 821
Wishart..... 88
Woodward 80, 453
Wordsworth 317
Wynford, Lord 535
Wyse..143, 269, 381, 471

York, Duke of..... 581

Zabarella 48
Zinzendorf..255, 736, 799
Zuinglius 588

INDEX TO TEXTS ILLUSTRATED OR REFERRED TO.

page
Gen. xiv. 17, 18, 20.. 347
xv. 12—17 352
xviii. 1, 2 302
xxii. 15, 16.... 302
xxxi. 11, 13 .. 302
xlvii. 29 482
Exod. iii. 2—4 302
xxxiv. 29—35. 347
Leviticus xxi. 284
Num. xiv. 34 288
xxii. 4, 5..295 350
Deuter. xxiii. 24, 25. 520
Judges vii. 4—22 .. 543
2 *Chron.* xiii. 10 230
xv. 3—7 .. 519
Nehemiah v. 15 353
Psalm xxii. 285
xxii. 27, 28 .. 519
xxvii. 5 523
xxx. 282
xlv. 514 515
xlviii..... 527
lxxii. 11 561
cxix. 346, 348
cxxvi. 3 634
Proverbs ii. 1—7 225
iii. 17 279
xvi. 31 484
xvii. 14.... 482
Canticles 353
Isa. i. 515
i. 26 519
v. 346
vi. 352
ix. 346
xi. 11 556
xi. 13, 14 519
xi. 345
xi. 11 514
xi. 15, 16..... 519
xi. 13, 14..... 519
xiv. 1, 2 519
xix. 24, 25 509
xxv. 10—12.... 519
Isa. xxvi. 1 519
xxvi. 11 543
xxvii. 12, 13, 518, 556
xxvii. 6..... 519
xxix..... 346
xxix. 17 519
xxx.—xxxii. .. 345
xxxii. 345
xxxii. 16—18 .. 519
xxxiii. 6—24 .. 519
xxxiv. 519
xxxv. 8..... 519
xli. 14, 16, 17, 19 519
xlii. 21 596
xliii. 5, 6 518
xlii. 19, 20 519
xliv. 3, 4 519
xlviii. 20, 21 .. 519
xlix. 11, 12 518
xlix. 18, 21, 22, 23 519
li. 3—16 519
lii. 1—12 519
liii. 16 484
liv. 1—3 519
liv. 5..... 519
liv. 11—13 519
liv. 13—17 519
lx. 12, 13 519
lx. 9—17 519
lx. 10, 16, 18 .. 519
lx. 12 519
lx. 18—21 519
lxi. 9..... 519
lxv. 345
lxv. 17—25 519
lxvi. 19, 20. 345, 519
lxvi. 18—21.... 519
Jer. ii. 346
iii. 4 667
iii. 346
iii. 18 518
iii. 17, 18 519
v. 346
Jer. viii. 346
xvi. 14, 15 518
xvi. 19 519
xxiii. 3 .... 518, 519
xxiii. 3—6 519
xxiii. 4 519
xxx. 7—10.. 518, 519
xxx. 8, 9, 18, 20, 21 519
xxxi..... 345
xxxi. 35, 36, 37 . 667
xxxi. 7, 8, 10 .. 518
xxxi. 27, 38, 40 . 519
xxxii. 37 .. 518, 667
xxxii. 34—41 .. 519
xxxiii. 345
xxxiii. 6—9.... 519
xxxiii. 14—26 .. 345
l. 4 519
l. 19, 2 519
Ezekiel iv. 4, 5, 6 .. 288
viii. 14—16 . 179
xiv. 346
xvi. 346
xx. 346
xxviii. 25, 26 519
xxxiv. 11 .. 519
xxxiv. 23, 24, 26, 27 519
xxxvi. 37, 38 519
xxxvii. 21, 22, 24, 25 519
xxxviii. 11 ... 519
xlviii. 22, 23 . 519
Daniel 228, 283
Hosea i. 10, 11 519
ii. 15..... 519
iii. 5 519
xi. 10—11..... 518
xii. 9, 10 519
Joel iii. 7, 8, 19, 20 . 519
iii. 17, 18..... 519
iii. 1—10..... 591

page

Amos ix. 13, 14 519
Obadiah 21 519
17, 18 519
Micah ii. 13 519
iv. 6--8, 11--13 519
v. 3 519
v. 5—7 519
vii. 15 519
vii. 16, 17..... 519
vii. 18—20 ... 519
Habakkuk ii. 11 219
Zephaniah iii. 10 ... 518
iii. 13 ... 519
iii. 19, 20 519
iii. 8, 9 ... 519
Haggai ii. 21—23 ... 519
Zechariah ii. 11—13. 519
ii. 13 519
iii. 9, 10... 519
viii. 7, 8... 518
viii. 13 ... 519
viii. 20--23 519
ix. 9 561
ix. 13—15 519
x. 8—10... 518
x. 5, 6 ... 519
x. 11 519
xii. 6 519
xiv. 5—9. 519
xiv. 10--11 519
Matthew iii. 9 526
v. 4 282
vi. 10 561
vii. 22 23
xii. 4..... 230
xvii. 119
xviii. 3 526
xxii. 30..... 452
xxviii. 514
Mark ii. 26 230
xiv. 3..... 120
xvi. 15 310
Luke vi. 4 230
ix. 23 279
xiv. 8 279
xix. 11, 12 666
xxii. 28—30 ... 666
xxiv. 49—53 ... 337
John vi. 39 564
xii. 27 282
xii. 33..... 279
xii. 41..... 352
xiv. 2, 3, 6.....281
xiv. 27 282
xv. 19..... 543
Acts i. 6, 7 666
viii. 13, 21, 23... 438
xiv. 22..... 279

page

Acts xxiv. 14 595
xxviii. 13 256
Romans 225
ii. 28, 29..... 439
ii. 28 526
viii. 30 563
ix..... 286
xi..... 286
xxii. 22—25. 348
1 *Cor.* 226
ii. 225
xiii. 11..... 522
xv..... 286
2 *Cor.* 226
i. 4—10 672
iii..... 347
iii. 16 347
iv. 2..... 353
vii. 5, 7 282
viii. 1, 2 280
Galatians..... 226
iii. 27 259
v. 6 596
v. 22 483
vi. 16 485
Ephesians 227
ii. 345
iii... 226, 286
iii. 18, 19
281, 284
iv..... 514
v. 2 281
v. 19 ... 251
Philippians 227
i. 29, 30 . 280
iii. 1 280
iii. 8 281
iv. 4 280
Colossians 227
ii. 20..... 456
iii. 14 ... 484
iii. 16 ... 251
1 *Thess.* 227
ii.. 514
iv. 13—18 . 286
iv. 220
v. 16 280
v. 6 220
2 *Thess.* 227, 345
ii. 1—12 ... 286
1 *Timothy* 227
iv. 1—5... 286
iv. 8 280
2 *Tim.* 227
ii. 11—12 ... 281
iii. 1—13..... 286
iii. 15 561
Titus 227

page

Titus iii. 13 229
iii. 1..... 472
iii. 4—7 438
Philemon 227
Hebrews 227
iv. 14—16 . 596
viii. 345
xii. 14 526
ix. 345
ix. 11..... 345
x. 34..... 280
xiii. 8 281
James 227
i. 1 280
i. 2, 3 280
i. 13, 14, 18, 21 601
i. 1—27 228
i. 17 ..... 537, 700
i. 22 ..... 526, 729
ii. 1—26 228
iii. 1—13 228
iii. 14 228
iv. 7—10 228
iv. 12—17 ... 228
v. 1—7 228
v. 1—9 286
1 *Peter* i. 1 280
i. 5—9..... 280
i. 4, 5 281
iii. 21 439
iv. 7..... 1, 2
iv. 8..... 484
iv. 12, 13 ... 280
iv. 12—19 ... 286
vi. 8 282
2 *Peter* 228
i. 19..... 345
ii. 16 352
ii..... 286, 345
ii. 13—17 ... 472
iii. 286
iii. 2 345
St. Jude 228, 286
4 345
1 *John* i. 3, 4 282
iii. 18 485
Rev. 228, 283
iii..... 285
iii. 7 281
iii. 21 279
iv..... 285
x..... 284, 286
xi. 19 284
xi. 26 345
xvi. 16..... 285
xvi. 12.... 519, 666
xix. 667
xxi. 667

INDEX TO SIGNATURES OF CORRESPONDENTS.

	page
A. B.	23
A Baconian	806, 810
A Canterbury Presbyter	234
A Churchman	696
A Curate	692
A Constant Reader	432, 809
A District Member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge	622
A Landsman	518
A Layman	303
A Lay Member of the Scottish Episcopal Church	444
An Anglican	304
Anglicanus	684
Anti-Lynch	34
Anti-Bonner	743
Anti-Papist	106
A Protestant	680
Archippus	220
A Reader of the New Series of the Christian Observer	629
Artemas	161, 229
A Slow Learner	158
A Village Pastor	565
Bernard	218
Catholicus	38
C. D.	232
C. E. P.	660
Charles Dodgson	507, 625
Chiaro-Obscuro	43
Civis	443, 632
Clericus Felix	224
—— ——	710
Didymus	562, 564
Didymus Secundus	624
D. R.	431
E. Bickersteth	224
E. H.	682
E. L. A.	49, 50, 120, 452
Ελπις	444
F. E. A.	163
F. S.	292
G.	119
G. T. ——	559
H. Jeffries	554, 613
H. L. W.	49
I. E. P.	51
I. H.	516
J. E.	310, 551
J. H.	676
J. J.	688
J. M. H.	7, 81, 119, 119, 214, 279, 344, 376, 417, 479, 542, 608
J. Pye Smith	17, 354, 508
Justus	443
Lacon	564
Laicus Gloucestriensis	567
L. R. G.	233
L. S. G.	611
Luther	354
M. F.	120
M. G.	220, 701
Miles	520
M. M.	18
N. O.	609
Nucifrangibulum	754
Nucleus	702
Old School	439
Pastor	680
Paulinus	287, 556
P. G.	89
Philalethes	517
Philologus	418
Φιλος	282, 809
Priscus	108
Q. S. M.	633
R. H.	310
R. J. M'Ghee	155
Rusticus	808
S. C. W.	50
Sosipater	99
Squirarchius	686
S. S.	704
Thomas Kelly	377
Tichycus	423
T. S.	451
U. U. S.	621, 672
Vacanus	451
W. E. H.	222
W. P. S.	520, 564
X. I. Y.	350
Y. F. A.	189
Zenas	81, 84, 254, 357, 422, 485, 546

Nuttall and Hodgson, Printers, Gough Square, London.

00111541

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 28 September, 2015